Library of the Theological Seminary.

PRINCETON, N. J.

Collection of Puritan Literature.

Division RL

Section

Number

11154 SCB

A TREATISE OF Justifying Righteousness, In Two Books:

I. A Treatise of *Imputed Righteousness*, opening and defending the True Sense, and confuting the False, with many of Dr. *Tullies* Reasonings against *Truth*, *Peace*, and *Me:* With an Answer to Dr. *Tullies* Letter, adjoyned.

II. A Friendly Debate with the Learned and Worthy Mr. *Christopher Cartwright*, containing:

1. His Animadversions on my Aphorisms, with my Answer.
2. His Exceptions against that Answer.
3. My Reply to the Summe of the Controversies agitated in those Exceptions.

All Published instead of a fuller Answer to the Assaults in Dr. *Tullies Justificatio Paulina*, for the quieting of Censorious and Dividing Contenders, who raise odious Reports of their Brethren as *Popish*, &c. who do but attempt Reconcilingly to open this Doctrine more clearly than themselves.

By *Richard Baxter*.

LONDON, Printed for *Nevil Simons* and *Jonath. Robinson*, at the Princes-Arms and Golden-Lion in St. *Pauls Church-Yard*, 1676.

To the Readers; especially all Faithful Ministers of Christ in *England*.

MY endeavours to save Men from the Libertine (called Antinomian) Errors, having led me to a distincter handling of some Points, than I had before found in the Authors I had read; and my first Conceptions of them (expressed in a small Book, called Aphorismes, &c.) being yet crude and defective, for want of Time, and use of Writing (which as the Lord Bacon saith, must make Men accurate) that being my First, some suspected it of Error in Doctrine, some of Novelty, and some only of divers undigested Expressions, and some overvaluing it, received those Imperfections with the rest: Whereupon publishing my desire of my Friends Animadversions, I received (as I have else-where with Thanks acknowledged) such as were very learned, judicious, and friendly; of which those of Mr. Lawson, Dr. Wallis, Mr. Jo. Warren, and Mr. Ch. Cartwright, were the chief; by which if I had not very much profited, I had been very dull. Of

these One *spake so agreeably to my Thoughts,* (*Dr.* W.) *that I had nothing but* Thanks *to return him: And the rest having shewed me the Incongruity of some* Expressions, *and the crudity of some Passages, received friendly my Answers in the little Matters that we differed in, which were rather about the* Aptness of Notions, *than the* Truth of Matter. *None of these were intended for Publick view, nor on* my part *were fit for it; for I wrote but in order to my further Learning. But at last, my Friend, Mr.* Sound, *who interceded between us for Communication of Papers, made me think, that Mr.* Cartwright *was not willing, that so large Pains, as he had taken, should be so buried: But I could not return him his* Exceptions *as he desired, because they were lost, (and I had no mind to be very inquisitive after them, in order to a Publick view) But some years after his death, they were found again.*

Being somewhat clearer in those Matters by all these Helps *and* Studies, *I published my* Suspension of the Aphorisms, *and my* Explication *and* Defence *of their Doctrine in my Confession, and my fuller Explication and defence in my* Apologie, *and* Disputations of Justification, *protesting against them, that would take the* Suspended Book *for my* Cleared-sense *without the* Confession. *To all these I remember no Answer that I have had, save some-what of Dr.* Owens (*Dr.* Kendales *and many others, were on other Accounts; and Mr.* Crandons, *Eyres,* &c. *were to the Aphorisms before*): *so that twenty years Silence made me think my Brethren pretty well satisfied, and the great fall of* Antinomianism *made me think that my Labour had not been in vain. But lately Dr.* Tully *in a Book called* Justificatio Paulina *hath Written, as you may see.* *Since*

Since all these Books, and in twenty fours years time (from the first) my conceptions of these Matters (unless I were very stupid) must needs be much ripened and ordered: I better discern what Notions are to be left out, and what Method is to be used as most apt for true Elucidation; I more discern than heretofore, how much of the Controversie is real, and how much verbal, which Le Blank *and* G. Forbes *have usefully opened, besides many others; and which in my* Cathol. Theol. *I have partly shewed, and more exactly in a* Methodus Theologiæ *not Printed: It was therefore many ways a trouble to me, that Dr.* Tully *should fall upon the* Aphorisms *without taking notice of any of the foresaid* Explications *or* Defences; *much more that he did it* in such a manner.

Supposing that a particular Answer to all his Words would be but useless to do a little *of that, which I had* fullier *done before, having returned here so much as I thought necessary, I have published my* Papers and Mr. Cartwrights *instead of the rest: And I have given you* entirely Mr. Cartwrights last, *though I answer but the Summe of them, so far as we differ, meerly lest I should wrong the Dead, by suppressing so learned and elaborate a Treatise, which I think he desired should not be suppressed. And if any think that he is* unanswered, *I leave them to profit by what-ever they shall find in him, which they think is against me, and passed by. He was a very Learned, Peaceable, Godly Man, known by his Rabbinical Commentary, and his* Defence *of King* Charles I. *against the Marques of* Worcester, *Successor to Mr* W. Fenner *in the* Staffordshire *Lecture against* Popery, *and after Minister in* York. *You may see that his acquaintance with* Protestant Writers *was very great, whose steps in ex-*

pri-

preſſions he was loth to leave, however he went not with the part that was for the Imputation of the Active Righteouſneſs, *and freely differeth in ſome other things.*

The firſt piece [of Imputed Righteouſneſs] *was written haſtily on another occaſion about three or four years ago: But for the brevity of the argumentative part was caſt by, with an intent to perfect it if I had time: Which being never like to have, upon this renewed aſſault from Dr.* Tully, *I thought it beſt to let it go as it is; this* latter part *which anſwereth* him *being newly annexed; as alſo the* Anſwer *to his angry Letter.*

My ſtrait is very great in dealing with this worthy Man: It grieveth me unfeignedly to diſhonour or grieve him: But had his Book been as much againſt my Perſon only, *and as little touched the* Doctrine *and* Intereſt *of the Church, as Biſhop* Morley's *againſt me did (to whom he dedicateth it) perhaps Self-denyal had commanded me ſilently to bear all, for the ſake of Peace. But where* Truth, Love *and* Peace *are joyntly intereſted, Reſpect to Man will not warrant me to deſert them: And it greatly troubleth me that his* Words *are ſuch, as cannot be* truly opened and anſwered *as they* are, *without ſomewhat which will diſpleaſe: And Guilt is tender, and Self-love ſtrong, and few Men judg of their own cauſe and words, as they would do of anothers; but if I have let fall any where any* ſuch words *as* his Letter *hath* many, *or if I repeat the* [Inſanis, deliras, &c.] *as oft as* Beza *did againſt* Illyricus, *or uſe ſuch words as* Calvin *did againſt* Baldwin, *or as other ſuch Perſons have ordinarily uſed, with whom I am not worthy to be named, and who are deſervedly honoured by him and me, when I find them, I ſhall* repent *of them, and I deſire him that*

that seeth any unwarrantable Sharpness, which I see not, not to imitate it; but in judging still to observe the Necessity of the Cause. *Though I lay not the Churches Concord and Mens Salvation upon* Logical *Definitions and Methods; yet I take* Method, *and* well-interpreted apt Names and Notions *to be of very great use to our clear distinct understanding of the Matter, and I fear no Censure more from my Brethren, than of* Over-doing *in that part: And I oft wonder at my self, to find how I grow more and more in Love, both with the* Primitive simplicity, *and with* accurateness of Notions *and* Method, *which seem to some to be contrary. But I find that it is the* former *that I more and more value, as our* Bread and Drink, our Food and Work, *which must principally take up* Mind *and* Life, *and be the* Matter and Means *of our* Peace *with* our selves *and* one another, *our* comfort in Life and Death, *and the terms of the* Churches Peace and Concord, *if ever we shall see such a blessed day, and be delivered from proud unreasonable Men. And it is principally for* Ornament, *and* greater Clearness, *and the* ending *of many* Controversies, *and the* perfecting *of our Minds with a* delightful useful higher *knowledg, and the more skilful managing sacred things, that I value and desire the* latter. *And while we agree in the former, I can differ from any in the latter, with a* Salvo *to Christian Love and Peace.*

If this worthy Person be over-angry with me, it is my duty to see that I deserve it not, and that I be not over-angry with him: Alas, the opening of each others Ignorance is a small part of our suffering from one another here. (Nay why is it not our gain, and matter of thanks, if Pride *and* Selfishness *prevail*

not: And if they do, alas, we have greater evils to lament!) If I cannot love those, that have endeavoured utterly to ruine me in the World, and taken from me more than Food and Rayment, even as much as in them lieth, thirteen years of my most mature and useful Age, wo unto me; for my want of love to Enemies will hurt me a thousand fold more than their most implacable Malice. Far then be it from us, to be cast into any Passions unbeseeming Brethren, by the different conceptions of sincere Men.

I know that it is my duty, as much as in me lieth, to live peaceably with all Men: But if God have called me to call the Militant Clergie from those Contentions, which for many Ages have been the sin and misery of the Churches, and hath intrusted me with any reconciling Means, *which have a special aptitude to quench the Flames, to clear up Truth, and recover Love and Christian Concord, I must not be false to such a trust, because some mistaking Opposers are displeased: If it be I that have plunged my self needlesly into a Controversie, which I am really a stranger to, and then in the pride of my heart am angry with him, who discovereth my Ignorance and Temerity, I beseech you freely call me to repentance: But if any other be most confident, where they most err, or are least acquainted, we are not for their sakes to wrong the Church: That Truth and Falshood, Good and Evil, should go under* right Characters, *and that Mens conceptions of them be* just such *as* they are, *is a matter of great importance to the World: It is a sort of* false Doctrine, *to represent* false Doctrine *(for the Persons sake)* less hurtful *or* monstrous *than it is: And if Men will take the detection of the deformity of their faults and errors, to be a* Dishonour *and* Injury *to* themselves,

who

who can help it? and who can save Men from themselves, *or preserve his honour, who will maculate it himself?*

I take it to be no small advantage to many doubting Readers, that (for all the heat) the two first Controversies *raised by this worthy Person (of* our Guilt of Parents sin, *and of my Rule for* preferring *the judgment of those that God hath most illuminated in cases of difficulty) have had so good an issue: For who will now* dissent, *when* he consenteth, *who sought to raise in Men such apprehensions of some dreadful danger? Nothing stands so safe, as that which is firm after the greatest assaults. If the strongest Winds overthrow not the House, it is not like to fall by less. And I hope this will be finally the issue of the rest.*

One thing I am ashamed of, but cannot help, viz. *That in this and all my Writings, the same things are so oft repeated: But it is partly for want of time to be duly accurate, and more because Mens renewed Importunity calleth for it (taking all as unsaid, which was said before), and chiefly because that the* Communication *of useful Truth is my* end, *and I find that a* few words *will not serve with most; and that is the best* Means, *which best attaineth the* End: *And if* all together *procure a due reception, I have what I desired, it being not the* Perfection *of a* Book, *or the Authors honour which I intend, but the edification of the Reader; to* whose Capacity, *as well as to the* Matter, *we must fit our words.*

If any think that I should have recited all the Doctors words *which I confute, I tell him, that I suppose him to have the Book it self before him; and that I doubt I have already been too long.*

I have been long employed in Controversie, while I

write

write against unnecessary Controversies; but it hath been to end them, *either by* removing the Mistakes *which* continue *them, or by shewing Men that see it not*, how far Contenders are agreed. *I profess my self one who (distinguishing of REAL and SIGNAL or ORGANICAL Knowledg) do take* Words *to be so far useful as they help us to know* Things, *and to* communicate *that knowledg; and therefore value* Words *but as* adapted *to* Things *and* Minds: *And I have but low thoughts of that Knowledg which reacheth no further than Words, or that which extendeth (or pretendeth) to* Things *by no other medium than* Words; *in comparison of that which perceiveth them as in* themselves, *or at least in their* likeness, *or* effects. *And therefore though I would have* Words *improved to the best advantage for Knowledg, I am so deeply sensible of* the *great imperfection of Mankind in the* Art *of Speaking, as that I greatly abhor the laying too much of the* Peace *of* Souls *or* Churches there-upon, *and making* Words *and* forms *of* Speech, *the engins of Cruelty or Division: (And I have long perceived too many forreign Criticks and Grammarians to have been (like* Paracelsians *in Physick) more* proud *and* boasting *far than the worth of their Learning would justifie, and to have too much vilified the School-Mens sort of Learning, (which was more real than most of theirs) while they rose up against their barbarous words) But whether (if* Words *in this Controversie must needs be more regarded than I have said) it be* my sayings, *or those that I* write against, *which have need of* this charitable Cover, *I leave you to judg,* 1. *By the Consequences of the unsound sense of Imputation hereafter opened.* 2. *And by this Catalogue of some of the Doctrines which I have long gain-said,* viz.

I. *That*

I. *That the Person of the Mediator was* Legally *or in* Gods account *the very* Person *of every single elect Sinner (even before that Sinner was a Person).*

II. *That every such Sinner (before he was) did in Law-sense, or in Gods reputation, perfectly fulfil all Gods Law in and by Christ.*

III. *And therefore the Law of Innocency doth justifie him as fulfilling it by another, and as an innocent Person, as from his first Being to his Death.*

IV. *That the same Person did himself Reputatively or in Law-sense, suffer in and by Christ, all the punishment due to him as a sinner, by the Threatning of the Law of Innocency, or of any Law of God; and that the Law did repute him both* Innocent *as fulfilling it by another, and a Sinner as breaking it himself.*

V. *That therefore no Elect person suffereth* any Punishment *in his own person.*

VI. *And that our sins were so imputed to Christ, as that he was accounted of God really a sinner, taking to him the* Reatum culpæ & non tantum pœnæ, vel Culpæ solum quo ad pœnam: *And so that he had* really *as much* Guilt *of sin it self as all the Elect; and was in* true Guilt *the worst Person that ever was in the World.*

VII. *That he was accordingly hated of God, as the worst guilty sinner.*

VIII. *That he suffered the same pains of Hell which we deserved,* (viz. *Torment of an accusing Conscience, privation of Gods Love and Spirit, under sin,* &c.)

IX. *That* his Righteousness *was not only a fulfilling of the Law* as it obliged him, *and his* Suffering, *the translated punishment of sinners* due to him by Assumption *and by the* Law *which imposed it on him; but the one was the* perfect fulfilling of all

Gods

Gods Law, as it obliged every Elect person; *and the other the perfect fulfilling of the threatning of Gods Law, as* it threatned the Persons of all the Elect.

X. *That therefore Christs suffering was not* satisfaction to the Law-giver *instead of the said* fulfilling of the Law, *but the fulfilling it self by us in Christ.*

XI. *That therefore every Elect person (say some) or every Believer (say others) is as Righteous as Christ was, by that perfect fulfilling of the Law; all his Righteousness being* ours it self as full proprietors, *because of our union with him; and not only* ours *in* Causality, *as meriting and procuring us Righteousness and Life.*

XII. *That therefore Justification and Righteousness is perfect at the first Instant.*

XIII. *That this Righteousness of Christ so imputed to us, as wholly our own in it self, is imputed to us as OUR SOLE RIGHTEOUSNESS.*

XIV. *That* Faith *is not imputed to us for Righteousness.*

XV. *That Christ is the only Person covenanted with by God: Or that it is the same Covenant and Law which is made with and for Christ, and which is made with and for us.*

XVI. *That we are not Justified by Faith in God the Father, or in the Holy Ghost.*

XVII. *That we are not Justified by believing in Christ as Christ intirely, or as our Teacher, Owner, King, Judg, or Intercessor in Heaven, nor by any of these, but only by* that Act *of* Faith, which receiveth his Righteousness as imputed to us.

XVIII. *That this* Receiving Act *is but* one in Specie Physica *(say some): but whether* Assent, *or* Consent, *or* Affiance, *and to what* one sole Verity

or

or Object, *is not agreed, and what Faculty it must be in, and whether in* one *or* two, *and how* one Act *can be in* two *Faculties* &c.) *yea (say others) it is but* one Individual Act, *because we are justified perfectly* simul & semel, *and so we are justified by a Faith of* one moment *only.*

XIX. *That believing in God the* Father, *or the* Holy Ghost, *and in* Christ as Teacher, &c. *and all* Faith in Christ; *save the* receiving his imputed Righteousness, *as also* Repentance, desiring Christ, confessing our unrighteousness, praying for Pardon, for the Spirit, for Heaven, hearing the Word, thankfulness for Christ, &c. *are all of them, those WORKS which St.* Paul *opposeth to* Faith *as to Justification: And therefore he that looketh to be justified by any of these, falleth from Grace by expecting Justification by Works.*

XX. *Therefore all Christians, who will be sure that they trust not to Works, and fall not from Grace, must know (among a multitude of Acts, which* [believing in Christ as Christ] *doth contain)* which *ONE* it is *that justifieth: (Which yet I never met with two Divines that agree in the exact description of).*

XXI. *That this ONE Justifying Act, doth justifie only as an Instrument, even the instrumental efficient Cause of our Justification.*

XXII. *That to expect Justification by that ONE Act of Faith under any other notion than that of* such an Instrument, *is to expect Justification by Works, even by* Faith as a Work, *and to fall from Grace.*

XXIII. *That we shall be judged at the great Day only by the* Law of Works, *as* fulfilled by Christ *for the* Elect *and not for Reprobates; and not by the* Law of Grace, *as* fulfilled *or* not fulfilled *by* our selves,

as it prescribeth the conditions of Life and Death.

XXIV. *That the Acts or Habits of Faith, Repentance, Love, Obedience, or any part of our fulfilling the conditions of Life in the Gospel, called commonly* our Inherent Righteousness, *are no part of the Matter of* any true Evangelical Justification: *That is, that either we* need no Justification *against the charge of* Infidelity, Impenitency, Rebellions, Unholiness, Hypocrisie; *or if we do, we are not to be justified against these particular Charges by* our Faith, Repentance, Obedience, Holiness, *and* Sincerity.

XXV. *That our said Graces, Holiness and Obedience, have no other use as to our Justification at Judgment, but as* Signs *of the* Instrumental *Act of* Faith, *proving it to our selves and others: And this is* [to be Judged according to our works].

XXVI. *That (though our* Jus ad impunitatem & ad Gloriam *be our Righteousness, (*in part *at least,) and* our Justification at Judgment *be the* justifying that Right, *yet) though Holiness, Obedience, and Perseverance, be* Conditions *of our* Glorification, *they are no* Conditions *of our* final Justification, *or* right to Glory.

These are the Opinions, this is part of the Body of Notional *Divinity, which I have written against these twenty eight years; besides the rest of grosser Antinomianism described in my Confession. And I am confident that this honest Doctor having neither mind nor leisure to see what it is indeed that I am doing, was (some-how) induced to take a snatch, where he thought by a short view he saw advantage, and to write against he knew not* whom or what.

If you ask, what that Doctrine is, that I set up instead of this, I must not still repeat: I refer you to a brief

brief sum of it in the Preface to my Disputation of Justification.

Or in a very few words, it may suffice plain Men to hold, 1. *That Christ in the Person of a Mediator, hath by his perfect Holiness and Obedience, and as a satisfactory Sacrifice for Sin,* Merited a Free-Gift of Himself as our Head, *and of* Pardon, Spirit *and* Glory *with and by Him; and as our* Interceſſor, *our* Owner *and* Ruler, *doth communicate what he merited.*

2. *That he hath made a* Covenant and Law of Grace *to be his* Donative *(and Condonative) Act and Instrument, which is our* Title *to the* given Benefits; *(or our* Fundamentum Juris.

3. *That this* Law and Covenant *prescribeth a* Condition *of the said* Right, *to be performed by our selves by the help of Grace (which is our* Conditio Juris).

4. *That this* Condition *is our* Faith, *or* Christianity, *as it is meant by Christ in the Baptismal Covenant,* viz. *To* give up our ſelves in Covenant believingly to God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt; *renouncing the contraries.*

5. *That though* true Conſent *to this Christian Covenant (called* Faith alone*) be the* full Condition *of our* firſt Right *to the benefits of that Covenant; (of which* Juſtification *is one) yet* Obediential *performance of the Covenant, and Conqueſt of temptations and Perſeverance, are* Secondary parts *of the condition of our Right as* continued *and* conſummate.

6. *That our Righteouſneſs, which muſt be the Matter of our full and final Juſtification, hath theſe parts,* 1. *Chriſts perfect* Righteouſneſs *and* Sacrifice, *as the* Meritorious Cauſe *of the* Free-Gift: 2. *Our* Right to Impunity *and* Glory *(and the Spirit) as being the* Righ-

Righteousnes given. 3. *And our* sincere performance of the Conditions of Justification and Life, *as being a* necessary subordinate Righteousnes.

7. *That because Christ will come in Judgment, not to* judg Himself, but us, *and will judg us* according to the Law of Grace, *as performers or not performers of his prescribed conditions of Pardon and Life, therefore his* Righteousnes *and* free *conditional Donation being presupposed, the Scripture throughout describeth the last Judgment as judging (that is, Justifying or Condemning) Men according to our (Evangelical) Works, or Preparations, and calleth us to* care and prepare *accordingly: I conclude with the words of our worthy and great Divines.*

Dr. Preston *of the Attributes, pag.* 72. [No Man believes Justification by Christ, but his Faith is mainly grounded on this Word of God: For in Scripture we find that Jesus Christ is come in the Flesh, and that he is a Lamb slain for the Forgiveness of Sins: That he is offered to every Creature: That a Man must thirst after him, and then take up his Cross and follow him. Now come to a Believer going out of the World, and ask him, what hope he hath to be saved: He will be ready to say, I know that Christ is come into the World, and offered up, and I know that I am one of them that have a part in Him: I know that I have fulfilled the Conditions, as that I should not continue willingly in any known sin, that I should love the Lord Jesus, and desire to serve Him above all: I know that I have fulfilled these Conditions; and for all this, I have the Word for my ground, *&c.*

Id. Tract. of Faith, pag. 44, 45. If I should define Justifying Faith to you, it must be thus described; It is a grace or habit infused into the Soul, whereby we are enabled to believe, not only that the Messiah is offered to us, but also to take and receive Him as a Lord and Saviour, that is, both to be saved by Him, and obey Him, *Vid. cat.*

But I have cited enough such else-where. See Dr. Field's *Append. to the 3d Book of the Church, and* Musculus *in* Gen. 22. 16. *pag.* 530. *and* Gen. 15. 6. *pag.* 352.

The Lord forgive our Weakness, and teach his Ministers the way of Peace, and make them as skilful in reconciling, as they have been in dividing.

OF THE IMPUTATION OF Christ's Righteousness TO BELIEVERS:

In what sence sound Protestants hold it; And,

Of the false devised sence, by which Libertines subvert the Gospel.

With an Answer to some common Objections, especially of Dr. *Thomas Tully*, whose *Justif. Paulina* occasioneth the publication of this.

By RICHARD BAXTER;

A compassionate Lamenter of the Churches wounds, caused by hasty judging and undigested conceptions, and by the Theological Wars which are hereby raised and managed; by perswading the World that meer verbal or notional Differences are *material*, and such as our Faith, Love, Concord and Communion must be measured by, for want of an exact discussion of the ambiguity of words.

London, Printed for *Nevil Simons* and *Jonathan Robinson*, at the Kings-Arms and Golden-Lion in St. *Pauls* Church-yard, 1675.

IMPUTATION
OF
Christ's Righteousness
TO
BELIEVERS

The Preface.

Reader,

IF thou blame me for writing again, on a Subject which I have written on so oft, and so lately (specially in my *Life of Faith*, and Disputations of Justification) I shall not blame thee for so doing; but I shall excuse my self by telling thee my reasons. 1. The occasion is many loud accusations of my self, of which I have before given an account. I publish it, because I see the Contention still so hot in the Church of Christ, and mens Charity destroyed against each other; one side calling the other *Socinians*, and the other *Libertines*, (who are neither of them *Christians*) and if I mistake not, for the most part in the dark about *one Phrase*, and that of mens devising, rather than about the sence: But if indeed it be the sence that they differ about, it's time to do our best to rectifie such Fundamental Errours.

I find that all of us agree in all the Phrases of Scripture. And a Mans Sence is no way known but by his expressions: The

queſtion is then, Which is the *neceſſary Phraſe* which we muſt expreſs our ſence by? We all ſay that to Believers, *Chriſt is made our Righteouſneſs; We are made the Righteouſneſs of God in him; He hath ranſomed, redeemed us, as a Sacrifice for our ſins, a price; He hath merited and obtained eternal Redemption for us, that Sin is remitted, covered, not imputed; that Righteouſneſs is Reckoned or Imputed to us; that Faith is Imputed to us for Righteouſneſs,* and any thing elſe that is in the Scripture. But all this will not ſerve to make us Chriſtians! What is wanting? Why, we muſt ſay that *Chriſts Righteouſneſs is Imputed to us as ours, and that Chriſt ſatisfied for our ſins!* Well; The thing ſignified ſeemeth to us true and good and needful, (though the Scripture hath as good words for it as any of us can invent.) We conſent therefore to uſe theſe Phraſes, ſo be it you put no falſe and wicked ſence on them by *other words* of your own: Though we will not allow them to be *neceſſary*, becauſe not in Scripture; (And we are more againſt adding new Fundamental Articles of Faith to the Scripture, than againſt adding new Orders, Forms or Ceremonies). But yet it will not ſerve: what is yet wanting? why, we muſt hold theſe words in a right ſenſe! What? yet are not your own deviſed

words

words a sufficient expression of the matter! When we have opened *those words* by *other words*, how will you know that we use those *other words* in a right sence, and *so in infinitum.* Our sence is, that *Righteousness is Imputed to us, that is, we are accounted Righteous, because for the Merits of Christs total fulfilling the Conditions of his Mediatorial Covenant with the Father, by his Habitual Holiness, his Actual Perfect Obedience, and his Sacrifice, or satisfactory Suffering for our sins in our stead, freely without any merit or Conditional act of mans, God hath made an Act of Oblivion and Deed of Gift, pardoning all sin, justifying and adopting and giving Right to the Spirit and Life eternally to every one that believingly accepteth Christ and the Gifts with and by and from him. And when we accept them, they are all ours by virtue of this purchased Covenant-Gift.* This is our short and plain explication. But yet this will not serve: Christianity is yet another thing. What is wanting? Why, we must say, that *Christ was habitually and actually perfectly Holy and Obedient, Imputatively in our particular Persons, and that each one of us did perfectly fulfil that Law which requireth perfect Habits and Acts in and by Christ imputatively, and yet did also in and by him suffer our selves Imputatively for not fulfilling it, and*

Imputatively did our selves both satisfy God's Justice and merit Heaven; and that we have our selves Imputatively a Righteousness of perfect Holiness and Obedience as sinless, and must be justified by the Law of Innocency, or Works, as having our selves imputatively fulfilled it in Christ; And that this is our sole Righteousness; and that Faith it self is not imputed to us for Righteousness; no not a meer particular subordinate Righteousness, answering the Conditional part of the new Justifying Covenant, as necessary to our participation of Christ, and his freely given Righteousness. And must all this go into our Christianity! But where is it written? who devised it? was it in the ancient Creeds and Baptism? Or known in the Church for five thousand years from the Creation? I profess I take the Pope to be no more to be blamed for making a new Church-Government, than for making us so many new Articles of Faith: And I will not justifie those that Symbolize with him, or imitate him in either.

But yet many of the men that do this, are good men in other respects: and I love their *zeal* that doth all this evil, *as it is for God* and the *honour of Jesus Christ*, though I love it not as blind, nor their Errour or their Evil. But how hard is it to know what Spirit we are of! But it is the doleful

mis-

miſchief which their blind zeal doth, that maketh me ſpeak; That three or four of them have made it their practice to back-bite my ſelf, and tell People, *He holdeth dangerous opinions; He is erroneous in the point of Juſtification. And his Books are unſound and have dangerous Doctrines; He leaveth the old way of Juſtification, he favoureth Socinianiſm,* and ſuch-like: this is a ſmall matter comparatively. Back-biting and *falſe reports,* are the ordinary fruits of *bitter contentious Zeal,* and the Spirit of a *Sect* as ſuch doth uſually ſo work (yea to confuſion and every evil work,) when it hath baniſhed the *Zeal* of Love and of Good Works. *Jam.* 3. 14, 15, 16. *Tit.* 2. 14. And I never counted it any great loſs to their followers, that they diſſwade them from the reading of my writings (as the Papiſts do their Proſelytes) as long as God hath bleſt our Land with ſo many better.

But there are other effects that command me once again to ſpeak to them. 1. One is, that I have good proof of the lamentable Scandal of ſome very hopeful Perſons of quality, who by hearing ſuch language from theſe men, have bin ready to turn away from Religion, and ſay, If they thus ſet againſt and condemn one another, away with them all.

2. Because divers great Volumes and other sad Evidence tells me that by their invented sence of Imputation, they have tempted many Learned men to deny Imputation of Christ's Righteousness absolutely, and bitterly revile it as a most Libertine Irreligious Doctrine.

3. But above all, that they do so exceedingly confirm the Papists. I must profess that *besides carnal Interest and the snare of ill Education*, I do not think that there is any thing in the World that *maketh or hardneth* and *confirmeth* Papists more, and *hindreth* their reception of the Truth, than these same well-meaning people that are most zealous against them, by two means: 1. One by *Divisions* and *unrulinesse* in Church-respects, by which they perswade men, especially Rulers, that without such a Center as the Papacy, there will be no Union, and without such *Violence* as theirs, there will be no Rule and Order. Thus one extreme doth breed and feed another. 2. The other is by this unsound sence of the Doctrine of *Imputation of Christs Righteousness*, (*with an unsound Description of Faith*) saying that every man is to believe it as Gods word (or *fide divinâ*) that his own sins are pardoned; which when the Papists read (that, these men make it one of the chief Points of our difference from Rome,)

Rome,) doth occasion them to triumph and reproach us, and confidently dissent from us in all the rest. I find in my self that my full certainty that they err in Transubstantiation and some other points, doth greatly resolve me to neglect them at least, or suspect them in the rest which seem more dubious. And when the Papists find men most *grosly erring* in the very point where they lay the main stress of the difference, who can expect otherwise, but that this should make them despise and cast away our Books, and take us as men self-condemned and already vanquished, and dispute with us with the prejudice as we do with an *Arrian* or *Socinian*? They themselves that cast away *our Books* because *they dissent from us*, may feel in themselves what the *Papists* are like to do on this temptation.

4. And it is not to be disregarded, that many private persons not studied in these points, are led away by the Authority of these men (for more than *Papists* believe as the Church believeth) to speak evil of the Truth, and sinfully to Backbite and Slander those Teachers, whom they hear others slander: and to speak evil of the things which they know not. And to see Gods own Servants seduced into *Disaffection* and *abuse* and *false Speeches* against those Ministers

sters that do most clearly tell them the truth, is a thing not silently to be cherished by any that are valuers of *Love* and *Concord* among Christians, and of the *Truth* and their *Brethrens Souls*, and that are displeased with that which the Devil is most pleased and God displeased with. These are my Reasons, submitted to every Readers Censure; which may be as various as their Capacities, Interests or Prejudices.

My Arguments in the third Chapter I have but briefly and hastily mentioned, as dealing with the lovers of naked Truth, who will not refuse it when they see it in its self-evidence. But they that desire larger proof, may find enough in Mr. *Gataker* and Mr. *Wotton de Reconcil.* and in *John Goodwin* of *Justification*, (If they can read him without prejudice). From whom yet I differ in the Meritorious Cause of our Justification, and take in the habitual and actual Holiness of Christ as well as his Sufferings, and equal in Merits; and think that *pardon it self* is *merited* by his *Obedience* as well as by his *Satisfaction*: To say nothing of some of his too harsh expressions, about the Imputation of Faith, and non-imputation of Christs Obedience, which yet in some explications he mollifyeth, and sheweth that his sence is the same with theirs that place all our Righteousness

in

in remission of Sin; such as (besides those after-mentioned) are *Musculus*, *Chamier*, and abundance more: And when one saith that *Faith* is *taken* properly, and another that it is taken Relatively in Imputation, they seem to mean the same thing: For Faith properly taken is essentiated by its *Object*; And what *Christ's* Office is, and what *Faith's* Office is, I find almost all Protestants are agreed in sence, while they differ in the manner of expression, except there be a real difference in this point *of simple Personating us in his perfect Holiness*, and making the *Person of a Mediator* to contain *essentially in sensu Civili the very Person of every elect sinner, and every such one to have verily been and done, in sensu civili, what Christ was and did.*

I much marvel to find that with most the Imputation of *Satisfaction* is said to be for *Remission of the penalty*, and Imputation of *perfect Holiness* for the obtaining of the *Reward Eternal Life*; and yet that the far greater part of them that go that way say, that *Imputation of all Christs Righteousness goeth first as the Cause, and Remission of Sin followeth as the Effect:* So even Mr. *Roborough* pag. 55. and others. Which seemeth to me to have this Sence, as if God said to a Believer, [*I do repute thee to have perfectly fulfilled the Law in Christ, and so to be no sinner,*

ner, and therefore forgive thee all thy sin.] In our sence it is true and runs but thus [*I do repute Christ to have been perfectly just habitually and actually in the Person of a Mediator in the Nature of Man, and to have suffered as if he had been a sinner, in the Person of a Sponsor, by his own Consent, and that in the very place, and stead of sinners*; and by this to have satisfyed my Justice, and by both to have merited free *Justification* and *Life*, to be *given by the new Covenant to all Believers*: *And thou being a Believer, I do repute thee justified and adopted by this satisfactory and meritorious Righteousness of Christ, and by this free Covenant-Gift, as verily and surely as if thou hadst done it and suffered thy self.*

For my own part I find by experience, that almost all Christians that I talk with of it, have just this very notion of our Justification which I have expressed, till some particular Disputer by way of Controversie hath thrust the other notion into their mind. And for peace-sake I will say again, what I have elsewhere said, that I cannot think but that almost all Protestants agree in the substance of this point of Justification (though some having not Acuteness enough to form their *Notions* of it rightly, nor Humility enough to suspect their Understandings, wrangle about *Words*, supposing it to be about

bout the *Matter*); Becauſe I find that all are agreed, 1. That no Elect Perſon is Juſtified or Righteous by Imputation while he is an Infidel or Ungodly (except three or four that ſpeak confuſedly, and ſupport the *Antinomians*) 2. That God doth not repute us to have done what Chriſt did in our *individual natural Perſons Phyſically:* The Controverſie is about a *Civil perſonating*. 3. That God judgeth not falſly. 4. That Chriſt was not our Delegate and Inſtrument ſent by us to do this in our ſtead, as a man payeth his debt by a Servant whom he ſendeth with the money. 5. That therefore Chriſts Righteouſneſs is not Imputed to us, as if we had done it by him as our Inſtrument. 6. That all the fruits of Chriſts Merits and Satisfaction are not ours upon our firſt believing (much leſs before). But we receive them by degrees: we have new pardon daily of new ſins: We bear caſtigatory puniſhments, even Death and Denials, or loſs of the greater aſſiſtance of the Spirit: Our Grace is all imperfect, &c. 7. That we are under a Law (and not left ungoverned and lawleſs) and that Chriſt is our King and Judge: And this Law is the Law or Covenant of Grace, containing, beſides the Precepts of perfect Obedience to the Law natural and ſuperadded, a *Gift of Chriſt with Pardon and Life*;

but

but only on Condition that we thankfully and believingly *accept the Gift*; And threatning non-liberation, and a far sorer punishment, to all that unbelievingly and unthankfully reject it. 8. That therefore this Testament or Covenant-Gift is God's Instrument, by which he giveth us our Right to Christ and Pardon and Life: And no man hath such Right but by this Testament-Gift. 9. That this, (called a Testament, *Covenant*, *Promise*, *and Law* in several respects) doth, besides the Conditions of our first Right, impose on us Continuance in the Faith, with sincere Holiness, as the necessary Condition of our continued Justification, and our actual Glorification. And that Heaven is the Reward of this keeping of the new Covenant, as to the *order of Gods Collation*, though as to the *value* of the Benefit, it is a *Free Gift*, purchased, merited and given by Christ. 10. That we shall all be judged by this Law of Christ. 11. That we shall all be judged according to our deeds; and those that have done good (not according to the Law of Innocency or Works, but according to the Law of Grace) shall go into everlasting life, and those that have done evil (not by meer sin as sin against the Law of Innocency) but by not keeping the Conditions

of

of the Law of Grace, shall go into everlasting punishment. The sober reading of these following texts may end all our Controversie with men that dare not grosly make void the Word of God. *Rev.* 20. 12, 13. 22. 12. *&* 2. 23.) 12. That to be Justified at the day of Judgment, is, to be *adjudged to Life Eternal, and not condemned to Hell.* And therefore to be the cause or condition that we are *Judged to Glory,* and the Cause or Condition that we are *Justified* then, will be all one. 13. That to be *Judged* according to our deeds, is to be *Justified* or *Condemned* according to them. 14. That the great tryal of that day (as I have after said) will not be, whether Christ hath done his part, but whether we have part in him, and so whether we have believed, and performed the Condition of that Covenant which giveth Christ and Life. 15. That the whole scope of Christ's Sermons, and all the Gospel, calleth us from sin, on the motive of avoiding Hell, (after we are reputed Righteous) and calleth us to Holiness, Perseverance and overcoming, on the motive of laying up a good Foundation, and having a Treasure in Heaven, and getting the Crown of Righteousness. 16. That the after-sins of men imputed Righteous deserve Hell, or at least temporal punish-

punishments, and abatements of Grace and Glory. 17. That after such sins, especially hainous, we must pray for Pardon, and repent that we may be pardoned, (and not say I fulfilled the Law in Christ as from my birth to my death, and therefore have no more need of Pardon.) 18. That he that saith he hath no sin, deceiveth himself, and is a lyar. 19. That Magistrates must punish sin as God's Officers; and Pastors by Censure in Christs name; and Parents also in their Children. 20. That if Christs *Holiness* and *perfect Obedience*, and Satisfaction and Merit, had bin *Ours* in *Right* and *Imputation*, as *simply* and *absolutely* and *fully* as it was *his own*, we could have no *Guilt*, *no* need of *Pardon*, no suspension or detention of the proper fruits of it, no punishment for sin, (specially not so great as the with-holding of degrees of Grace and Glory); And many of the consequents aforesaid could not have followed.

All this I think we are all agreed on; and none of it can with any face be denied by a Christian. And if so; 1. Then whether Christs *perfect Holiness* and *Obedience*, and *Sufferings*, *Merit* and *Satisfaction*, be all given us, and imputed unto us at our first believing as *Our own* in the very thing it self, by a full and proper *Title* to the thing:

Or

Or only so *imputed to us*, as to be *judged a just cause of giving us all the effects in the degrees and time forementioned as God pleaseth*, let all judge as evidence shall convince them. 2. And then, whether they do well that thrust their devised sence on the Churches as an Article of Faith, let the more impartial judge. XXX

I conclude with this confession to the Reader, that though the matter of these Papers hath been thought on these thirty years, yet the Script is *hasty*, and defective in order and fulness; I could not have leisure so much as to affix in the margin all the texts which say what I assert: And several things, especially the state of the Case, are oft repeated. But that is, lest once reading suffice not to make them observed and understood; which if many times will do, I have my end. If any say, that I should take time to do things more accurately, I tell him that I know my straights of time, and quantity of business better than he doth; and I will rather be defective in the mode of one work, than leave undone the substance of another as great.

July, 20. 1672. *Richard Baxter.*

The Contents.

CHap. 1. *The Hiſtory of the Controverſie, In the Apoſtles days: In the following Ages.* Auguſtine *and his followers Opinion. The Schoolmen.* Luther: Illebius: *The Lutherans*: Andr. Oſiander: *The latter German Divines who were againſt the Imputation of Chriſt's Active Righteouſneſs: Our Engliſh Divines:* Davenant's *ſenſe of Imputation.* Wotton. de Reconcil. Bradſhaw, Gataker, *Dr.* Criſp, Jo. Simpſon, Randal, Towne, *&c. And the Army-*Antinomians *checkt by the riſing of* Arminianiſm *there againſt it.* Jo. Goodwin, *Mr.* Walker, *and Mr.* Roborough; *Mr.* Ant. Burges; *My Own endeavours*; *Mr.* Cranden, *Mr.* Eyres, *&c. Mr.* Woodbridge, *Mr.* Tho. Warren, *Mr.* Hotchkis, *Mr.* Hopkins, *Mr.* Gibbon, *Mr.* Warton, *Mr.* Grailes, *Mr.* Jeſſop: *What I then aſſerted*: Corn. a Lapide, Vaſquez, Suarez, Grotius de Satisf. *Of the Savoy Declaration*; *Of the Faith of the Congregational-Divines: Their ſaying that Chriſts Active and Paſſive Obedience is imputed for our ſole Righteouſneſs, confuted by Scripture.* Gataker, Uſher, *and* Vines *read and approved my Confeſſion of Faith.* Placeus *his Writings and trouble about the Imputation of* Adam's *Sin. Dr.* Gell, *Mr.* Thorndike, *&c. vehemently accuſing the doctrine of Imputed Righteouſneſs. The Conſent of all Chriſtians, eſpecially Proteſtants, about the ſenſe of Imputed Righteouſneſs* 1. *The form of Baptiſm.* 2. *The Apoſtles Creed.* 3. *The* Nicene *and* Conſtantinopolitan *Creed.* 4. Athanaſius's *Creed.* 5. *The Fathers ſenſe:* Laurentius *his Collections:* Damaſus *his Creed.* 6. *The* Auguſtan

ſtan *Confeſſion.* 7. *The* Engliſh *Articles, Homilies and Confeſſion.* 8. *The* Saxon *Confeſſion.* 9. *The* Wittenberg *Confeſſion.* 10. *The* Bohemian *Confeſſion.* 11. *The* Palatinate *Confeſſion.* 12. *The* Polonian *Confeſſions.* 13. *The* Helvetian *Confeſſion.* 14. *The* Baſil *Confeſſion.* 15. *The* Argentine *Confeſſion of the four Cities.* 16. *The Synod of* Dort, *and the* Belgick *Confeſſion.* 17. *The* Scottiſh *Confeſſion.* 18. *The* French *Confeſſion. Whether Imputation of Paſſion and Satisfaction, or of meritorious Perfection go firſt: How Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is called the formal Cauſe, &c. That it is confeſſed that Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is imputed to us, as our ſin was to him.* Molinæus: Mareſius, Vaſſeur, Bellarmine *is conſtrained to agree with us. A recommendation of ſome brief, moſt clear, and ſufficient Treatiſes on this ſubject*; viz. 1. *Mr.* Bradſhaw; 2. *Mr.* Gibbon's *Sermon*; 3. *Mr.* Truman's *Great Propitiation.* 4. Placeus *his Diſput. in Theſ. Salmur.* 5. Le Blank's *Theſes: And thoſe that will read larger, Mr.* Watton, John Goodwin, *and Dr.* Stillingfleet.

Chap. 2. *The opening of the Caſe, by ſome Diſtinctions, and many Propoſitions:* Joh. Crocius *Conceſſions premiſed: Mr.* Lawſon's *Judgment.*

Chap. 3. *A further Explication of the Controverſie.*

Chap. 4. *My Reaſons againſt the denied ſenſe of Imputation and perſonating. The denied ſenſe repeated plainly. Forty three Reaſons briefly named.*

Chap. 5. *Some Objections anſwered.*

Chap. 6, 7, 8. *Replies to Dr.* Tully; *and a Defence of the Concord of* Proteſtants *againſt his Military Alarm, and falſe pretence of greater diſcord than there is.*

Of

Of the Imputation of Christs Righteousnes (Material or Formal) to Believers:

Whether we are Reputed personally to have suffered on the Cross, and to have satisfied God's Justice for our own sins, and to have been habitually perfectly Holy, and Actually perfectly Obedient, in Christ, or by Christ, and so to have merited our own Justification and Salvation. And whether Christ's Righteousnes Habitual Active and Passive, be strictly made our own Righteousnes, in the very thing it self simply Imputed to us, or only be made ours in the effects, and Righteousnes Imputed to us when we believe, because Christ hath satisfied and fulfilled the Law, and thereby merited it for us. The last is affirmed, and the two first Questions denied.

I Have said so much of this subject already in my Confession, but especially in my Disputations of Justification, and in my Life of Faith that I thought not to have meddled with it any more; But some occasions tell me that it is not yet needless, though those that have most need will not read it. But while some of them hold, that nothing which they account a Truth about the *Form* and *Manner* of *Worship* is to be silenced for the Churches peace, they should grant to me that *Real*

Truth so near the Foundation (in their own account) is not to be silenced when it *tendeth unto Peace.*

In opening my thoughts on this subject I shall reduce all to these Heads. 1. I shall give the brief *History* of this Controversie. 2. I shall open the true state of it, and assert what is to be asserted, and deny what is to be denied. 3. I shall give you the Reasons of my Denials. 4. I shall answer some Objections.

CHAP. I.

The History of the Controversie.

§ 1. IN the Gospel it self we have first *Christ's Doctrine delivered by his own mouth.* And in that there is so little said of this Subject that I find few that will pretend thence to resolve the Controversie, for Imputation in the rigorous sence. The same I say of the Acts of the Apostles, and all the rest of the New Testament, except *Pauls* Epistles.

The Apostle *Paul*, having to do with the *Jews*, who could not digest the equalizing of the *Gentiles* with them, and specially with the factious Jewish Christians, who thought the *Gentiles* must become *Proselytes* to *Moses* as well as to Christ, if they would be Justified and Saved, at large confuteth this opinion, and freeth the Consciences of the Gentile Christians from the Imposition of this yoke (as also did all the Apostles, *Act.* 15.) And in his arguing

guing, proveth that the Mosaical Law is so far from being necessary to the Justification of the *Gentiles*, that *Abraham* and the Godly *Jews* themselves were not Justified by it, but by *Faith*; And that by the *works of it* (and consequently not by the works of the Law or Covenant of Innocency, which no man ever kept) no man could ever be justified: And therefore that they were to look for Justification by Christ alone, and by Faith in him, or by meer Christianity; which the *Gentiles* might have as well as the *Jews*, the Partition-wall being taken down. This briefly is the true scope of *Paul* in these Controversies.

§ 2. But in *Paul's* own days, there were some things in his Epistles which the unlearned and unstable did wrest, as they did the other Scriptures, to their own destruction, as *Peter* tells us, 2 *Pet.* 2. And it seemeth by the Epistle of *James*, that this was part of it: For he is fain there earnestly to dispute against some, who thought that Faith without Christian works themselves, would justifie, and flatly affirmeth, that we are *Justified by Works, and not by Faith only*; that is, as it is a *Practical Faith*, in which is contained a *Consent* or *Covenant* to *obey*, which first putteth us into a justified state; so it is that *Practical Faith actually working by Love*, and the *actual performance* of our *Covenant*, which by *way* of *Condition* is *necessary* to our *Justification*, as *Continued* and as *Consummate by the Sentence of Judgment*. Against which sentence of *James* there is not a syllable to be found in *Paul*. But all the Scripture agreeth that *all men shall be Judged*, that is, *Justified* or *Condemned*, *according to their works*. But it is not this Controversie (between *Faith and*

Works) which I am now to speak to, having done it enough heretofore.

§ 3. From the days of the Apostles till *Pelagius* and *Augustine*, this Controversie was little meddled with: For the truth is, the Pastors and Doctors took not Christianity in those days for a matter of Sholastick subtilty, but of plain *Faith* and *Piety*. And contented themselves to say that Christ dyed for our sins, and that we are Justified by Faith; and that Christ was made unto us Righteousness, as he was made to us Wisdom, Sanctification and Redemption.

§ 4. But withal those three first Ages were so intent upon Holiness of Life, as that they addicted their Doctrine, their Zeal, and their constant endeavours to it: And particularly to great austerities to their Bodies, in great Fastings, and great contempt of the World, and exercises of Mortification, to kill their fleshly Lusts, and deny their Wills, and Worldly Interests; to which end at last they got into Wildernesses, and Monasteries, where, in Fasting and Prayer, and a single life, they might live as it were out of the World, while they were in it; (Though indeed *persecution* first drove them thither to save themselves.) Into these Deserts and Monasteries those went that had most Zeal, but not usually most *Knowledg*: And they turned much of their Doctrine and discourses about these Austerities, and about the practices of a Godly Life, and about all the Miracles which were (some really) done, and (some feigned) by credulous soft people said to be done among them. So that in all these ages most of their writings are taken up, 1. In defending Christianity against the Heathens, which was the work

work of the Learned Doctors. 2. And in confuting swarms of Heresies that sprung up. 3. And in matters of Church-order, and Ecclesiastical and Monastical discipline. 4. And in the precepts of a Godly Life: But the point of Imputation was not only not meddled with distinctly, but almost all the Writers of those times, seem to give very much to *Mans free-will*, and to *works of Holiness*, and *Sufferings*, making too rare and obscure mention of the distinct Interests of Christs Merits in our Justification, at least, with any touch upon this Controversie: Yet generally holding *Pardon*, and *Grace* and *Salvation* only by Christs Sacrifice and Merits; though they *spake* most of *Mans Holiness*, when they called men to seek to make sure of Salvation.

§ 5. And indeed at the day of Judgment, the Question to be decided, will not be, Whether Christ dyed and did his part, but, Whether we believed and obeyed him and did our part: Not, Whether Christ performed his Covenant with the Father; but, Whether we performed our Covenant with him: For it is not Christ that is to be judged, *but we by Christ*.

§ 6. But *Pelagius* and *Augustine* disputing about the Power of Nature and Freewill and the Grace of Christ, began to make it a matter of great Ingenuity (as *Erasmus* speaketh) to be a Christian. *Pelagius* (a *Brittain*, of great wit, and continence, and a good and sober life, as *Austin* saith, *Epist.* 120.) stifly defended the Power of Nature and Freewill, and made Grace to consist only in the free Pardon of all sin through Christ, and in the *Doctrine* and *Perswasions* only to a holy life for the time to come, with Gods common ordinary help. *Augustine* copiously

ously (and justly) defended God's special eternal Election of some, and his special Grace given them to make them repent and believe, and persevere: (For though he maintained that some that were true Believers, Lovers of God, Justified and in a state of Salvation, did fall away and perish, yet he held that none of the *Elect* did fall *away and perish*; And he maintained that even the Justified that fell away, had their Faith by a special Grace above nature.) *Vid. August. de bono Persever. Cap.* 8, *&* 9. *& de Cor. & Grat. Cap.* 8, *&* 9. *& alibi passim.*

§ 7. In this their Controversie, the point of Justification fell into frequent debate: But no Controversie ever arose between them, *Whether Christ's personal Righteousness considered Materially or Formally*, was by Imputation made ours as Proprietors of the thing it self, distinct from its effects; or, Whether God reputed us to have satisfied and also perfectly obeyed in Christ. For *Augustine* himself, while he vehemently defendeth free Grace, speaketh too little even of the Pardon of sin: And though he say, that *Free Pardon* of sins is part of Grace, yet he maketh *Justification* to be that which we call Sanctification, that makes us inherently Righteous or new-Creatures, by the operation of the Holy Ghost: And he thinketh that this is the Justification which *Paul* pleadeth to be of Grace and not of works; yet including *Pardon of sin*, and confessing that *sometimes* to Justifie, signifieth in Scripture, not to make just, but to *judg just*. And though in it self this be but *de nomine*, and not *de re*; yet, 1. no doubt but as to many texts of Scripture *Austin* was mistaken, though some few texts *Beza* and others confess to be taken in his sence: 2. And the exposition of many

many texts lieth upon it. But he that took Justification to be by the operation of the Holy Ghost giving us Love to God, could not take it to be by Imputation in the rigorous sence no question; nor doth *de re.*

§ 8. But because, as some that, it seems, never read *Augustine*, or understood not plain words, have nevertheless ventured confidently to deny what I have said of his Judgment in the points of Perseverance (in my Tract of Perseverance) so, it's like such men will have no more wariness what they say in the point of Justification; I will cite a few of *Augustin's* words among many, to show what he took Justification to be, though I differ from him *de nomine.*

Nec quia recti sunt corde, sed etiam ut recti sint corde, pretendit Justitiam suam, quâ justificat impium —— Quo motu receditur ab illo fonte vitæ, cujus solius haustu justitia bibitur, bona scil. vita. Aug. *de* Spir. *&* Lit. Cap. 7.

Deus est enim qui operatur in eis & velle & operari, pro bona voluntate. Hæc est Justitia Dei, hoc est, quam Deus donat homini quum justificat impium. Hanc Dei justitiam ignorantes superbi Judæi, & suam volentes constituere, justitiæ Dei non sunt subjecti. —— Dei quippe dixit Justitiam, quæ homini ex Deo est, suam vero, quam putant sibi sufficere ad facienda mandata sine adjutorio & dono ejus qui legem dedit. His autem similes sunt qui cum profiteantur se esse Christianos, ipsi gratiæ Christi sic adversantur ut se humanis viribus divina existiment implere mandata. Epist. 120. cap. 21. *&* 22. *&* Epist. 200.

Et de Spir. *&* lit. c. 26. *Factores justificabuntur: —— Non tanquam per opera, nam per Gratiam justificentur:*

ficentur : Cum dicat Gratis justificari hominem per fidem sine operibus legis, nihilque aliud velit intelligi, in eo quod dicit Gratis, nisi quia justificationem opera non precedunt : Aperte quippe alibi dicit, si gratiâ, jam non ex operibus : alioquin gratia non est gratia. Sed sic intelligendum est, factores Legis justificabuntur, ut sciamus eos non esse factores legis nisi justificentur ; ut non justificatio factoribus accedat, sed factores legis justificatio precedat : Quid est enim aliud Justificati, quam Justi facti, ab illo scilicet qui justificat Impium, ut ex impio fiat justus ? —— Aut certe ita dictum est, Justificabuntur, ac si diceretur Justi habebuntur, justi deputabuntur.

Et ibid. cap. 29. *Gentes quæ non sectabantur justitiam apprehenderunt justitiam, Justitiam autem quæ ex fide est, impetrando eam ex Deo, non ex seipsis presumendo ; Israel vero persequens legem justitiæ, in legem justitiæ, non pervenit : Quare ? Quia non ex fide, sed tanquam ex operibus : id est tanquam eam per seipsos operantes ; non in se credentes operari Deum. Deus est enim qui operatur in nobis —— Finis enim legis Christus est omni credenti. Et adhuc dubitamus quæ sint opera legis, quibus homo non justificatur ; si ea tanquam sua crediderit sine adjutorio & dono Dei, quod est ex fide Jesu Christi —— Ut possit homo facere bona & Sancta, Deus operatur in homine per fidem Jesu Christi, qui finis ad Justitiam omni credenti : id est, per Spiritum incorporatus factusque membrum ejus, potest quisque illo incrementum intrinsecus dante, operari justitiam. —— Justificatio autem ex fide impetratur —— In tantum justus, in quantum salvus. Per hanc enim fidem credemus, quod etiam nos Deus a mortuis excitet interim Spiritu, ut in novitate ejus gratiæ temperanter & juste & pie viva-*

vivamus in hoc seculo — qui in Resurrectione sibi congrua, hoc est, in Justificatione precedit: —— c. 30. *Fides impetrat gratiam qua Lex impleatur.* ——

Cap. 28. pag. 315. *Ibi Lex Dei, non ex omni parte delata per injustitiam, profecto scribitur, renovata, per gratiam: Nec istam inscriptionem, quæ Justificatio est, poterat efficere in Judæis Lex in tabulis scripta.*

Ibid. Cap. 9. pag. 307, 308. *Justitia Dei manifestata est: non dixit, Justitia hominis vel justitia propriæ voluntatis, sed justitia Dei; Non qua Deus justus est; sed qua induit, hominem cum justificat impium. Hæc testificatur per Legem & Prophetas. Huic quippe testimonium perhibent Lex & Prophetæ. Lex quidem hoc ipso, quod jubendo, & minando, & neminem justificando, satis indicat dono Dei justificari hominem per* Adjutorium Spiritus —— *Justitia autem Dei per fidem Jesu Christi, hoc est, per fidem qua Creditur in Christum: sicut autem ista fides Christi dicta non est, qua Credit Christus, sic & illa Justitia Dei non qua Justus est Deus. Utrumque enim Nostrum est sed ideo Dei & Christi dicitur quod ejus nobis largitate donatur.* —— *Justitia Dei sine lege est, quam Deus per* Spiritum Gratiæ *Credenti confert sine adjutorio legis.* —— *Justificati gratis per gratiam ipsius: non quod sine voluntate nostra fiat, sed voluntas nostra ostenditur infirma per legem, ut sanet Gratia Voluntatem, & sanata voluntas impleat Legem.* —— *Et* cap. 10. *Confugiant per fidem ad Justificantem Gratiam, & per donum Spiritus suavitate justitiæ delectati, pœnam literæ minantis evadant.* Vid. Ep. 89. *q.* 2. *Et* lib. 3. *ad* Bonifac. c. 7.

Et Tract. 3. in Joan. when he saith that, *Omines qui per Christum Justificati justi, non in se, sed in illo*; he expoundeth it of Regeneration by Christ.

Et

Et Serm. 15. de verb. Apoſt. *Sine voluntate tua non erit in te Juſtitia Dei. Voluntas non eſt niſi tua; Juſtitia non eſt niſi Dei:* he expounds it of Holineſs. —— *Traditus eſt propter delicta noſtra, & reſurrexit, propter juſtificationem noſtram. Quid eſt, Propter Juſtificationem noſtram? Ut juſtificet nos, & juſtos faciat nos. Eris opus Dei non ſolum quia homo es, ſed quia Juſtus es: Qui fecit te ſine te, non te juſtificat ſine te: Tamen ipſe juſtificat, ne ſit juſtitia tua.* —— *Dei juſtitiam dat non litera occidens, ſed* vivificans Spiritus. —— Vid. *de* Grat. Chriſti Cap. 13, 14.

Abundance ſuch paſſages in *Auguſtine* fully ſhew that he took Juſtification to ſignifie Sanctification, or the Spirits renovation of us; and thinks it is called the Righteouſneſs of God and Chriſt, and not ours, becauſe by the Spirit he worketh it in us. And when he ſaith that *bona opera ſequuntur Juſtificatum, non precedunt Juſtificandum* (as in ſence he often doth) he meaneth that we are *freely ſanctified*, before we do good. I would cite abundance, but for ſwelling the writing, and tiring the Reader. And his followers *Proſper*, and *Fulgentius* go the ſame way, as you may eaſily find in their writings.

Johan. Crocius in his copious Treatiſe of Juſtification, *Diſp. 9. p.* 442. ſaith, *Auguſtinum Juſtificationis nomine utramque partem complecti, id eſt, tum Remiſſionem peccatorum quæ proprie Juſtificatio dicitur, tum Sanctificationem —— Cum quo nos ſentimus quoad rem ipſam, tantum diſſidemus in loquendi formâ.*

§ 9. The Schoolmen being led by the Scholaſtick wit of *Auguſtine*, fell into the ſame phraſe of ſpeech and opinions, *Lombard* making *Auguſtine* his

his Master, and the rest making him theirs, till some began to look more towards the Semipelagian way.

§ 10. And when Church-Tyranny and Ignorance, had obscured the Christian Light, the true sence of Justification by the Righteousness of Christ, was much obscured with the rest, and a world of humane inventions under the name of Good works, were brought in to take up the peoples minds; And the merits of man, and of the Virgin *Mary*, sounded louder than the merits of Christ, in too many places: And the people that were ignorant of the true Justification, were filled with the noise of Pardons, Indulgences, Satisfactions, Penances, Pilgrimages, and such like.

§ 11. *Luther* finding the Church in this dangerous and woful state, where he lived, did labour to reduce mens minds and trust, from humane fopperies and merits, and indulgences, to Christ, and to help them to the Knowledg of true Righteousness: But according to his temper in the heat of his Spirit, he sometimes let fall some words which seemed plainly to make Christs own personal Righteousness in it self to be every Believers own by Imputation, and our sins to be verily Christs own sins in themselves by Imputation: Though by many other words he sheweth that he meant only, that our sins were Christs in *the effects* and not in themselves, and Christs personal Righteousness ours in the effects and not in it self.

§ 12. But his Book on the *Galatians*, and some other words, gave occasion to the errours of some then called *Antinomians*, and afterward *Libertines* (when some additions were made to their errours.) Of these *Islebius Agricola* was the chief: Whom

Luther

Luther confuted and reduced, better expounding his own words: But *Istebius* ere long turned back to the Contrary extreme of Popery, and with *Sidonius* and *Julius Pflug*, (three Popish Bishops made for that purpose) promoted the Emperours *Interim* to the persecution of the Protestants.

§ 13. The Protestant Reformers themselves spake variously of this subject. Most of them rightly asserted that Christ's Righteousness was ours by the way of Meriting our Righteousness, which was therefore said to be Imputed to us. Some of them follow'd *Luthers* first words, and said that Christs sufferings and all his personal Righteousness was Imputed to us, so as to be ours in it self, and when judged as if we had personally done what he did, and were righteous with the same Righteousness that he was.

§ 14. *Ambsdorfius*, *Gallus*, and some other hot *Lutherans* were so jealous of the *name* of works, that they maintained that good works were not necessary to Salvation. (Yea as to Salvation some called them hurtful:) And *Georgius Major* a Learned sober Divine was numbered by them among the *Hereticks*, for maintaining that Good works were necessary to Salvation; as you may see in the perverse writings of *Chlusseburgius* and many others.

§ 15. *Andreas Osiander* (otherwise a Learned Protestant) took up the opinion, that we are Justified by the very essential Righteousness of God himself. But he had few followers.

§ 16. The Papists fastening upon those Divines who held Imputation of Christs personal Righteousness in it self in the rigid sence, did hereupon greatly insult against the Protestants, as if it had been

been their common doctrine, and it greatly stopt the Reformation: For many seeing that some made that a Fundamental in our difference, and *articulus stantis & cadentis Ecclesiæ*, and seeing how easily it was disproved, how fully it was against the Doctrine of all the ancient Church, and what intolerable Consequences followed, did judge by that of the rest of our Doctrine, and were settledly hardened against all.

§ 17. The Learned Divines of *Germany* perceiving this, fell to a fresh review of the Controversie, and after a while abundance of very Learned Godly Doctors fell to distinguish between the Active and Passive Righteousness of Christ; and not accurately distinguishing of Imputation, because they perceived that Christ suffered in our stead, in a fuller sense than he could be said to be *Holy* in our stead, or fulfil the Law in our stead. Hereupon they principally managed the Controversie, as about the sort of Righteousness Imputed to us: And a great number of the most Learned famous Godly Divines of the Reformed Churches, maintained that Christ's Passive Righteousness was Imputed to us, even his whole Humiliation or Suffering, by which the pardon of all sins of Commission and Omission was procured for us; but that his *Active Righteousness* was not Imputed to us, though it profited us; but was *Justitia Personæ* to make Christ a fit Sacrifice for our sins, having none of his own, but the Suffering was his *Justitia Meriti*. His Obedience they said was performed *nostro bono, non nostro loco*, for our good but not in our stead; but his *Sufferings*, both *nostro bono & loco*, both *for our good* and in *our stead*: but neither of them so strictly *in nostrâ Personâ* in our Person, as if we did it by and in Christ. The Writers that de-

fended this were *Cargius*, and that holy man *Olevian* and *Vrsine*, and *Paræus*, and *Scultetus*, and *Piscator*, *Alstedius*, *Wendeline*, *Beckman*, and many more. He that will see the sum of their arguings may read it in *Wendeline's Theolog. lib.* 1. *cap.* 25. and in *Paræus* his *Miscellanies* after *Vrsine's Corpus Theolog.* After them *Camero* with his Learned followers took it up in France. *Leg. Cameron. p.* 364.390. *Thes. Sal. vol.* 1. *Placæi Disp. de Just.* § 29. *& Part.* 2 *de Satisf.* § 42. So that at that time (as *Paræus* tells you) there were four opinions: some thought Christ's Passive Righteousness only was Imputed to us; some also his *Active* instead of our Actual Obedience; some also his *Habitual* instead of our Habitual perfection; And some thought also his Divine Righteousness was Imputed to us, because of our Union with Christ, God and Man. (Imputed I say; for I now speak not of *Osiander's* opinion of Inhesion.) And *Lubbertus* wrote a Conciliatory Tractate favouring those that were for the Passive part. And *Forbes* hath written for the Passive only imputed. *Molinæus* casteth away the distinction, *Thes. Sedan. v.* 1. *p.* 625. § 18.

§ 18. In England most Divines used the phrase, that we were Justified by the forgiveness of sin and the Imputation of Christs Righteousness, and being accepted as Righteous unto life thereon: But the sense of Imputation few pretended accurately to discuss. *Davenant* who dealt most elaborately in it, and maintaineth Imputation stiffly, in terms; yet when he telleth you what Protestants mean by it, saith, that [*Possunt nobis imputari, non solum nostræ passiones, actiones, qualitates, sed etiam extrinseca quædam, quæ nec a nobis fluunt, nec in nobis hærent*

lent : De facto autem Imputantur, quando illorum intuitus & respectus valent nobis ad aliquem effectum, æque ac si a nobis aut in nobis essent. (Note, that he saith, but *ad aliquem effectum, non ad omnem.*) And he instanceth in one that is a *slothful fellow himself, but is advanced to the Kings Favour and Nobility for some great Service done by his Progenitors to the Common-wealth.* And in *one that deserving death is pardoned through the Intercession of a friend, or upon some suffering in his stead which the King imposeth on his Friend.* This is the Imputation which *Davenant* and other such Protestants plead for; which I think is not to be denied. Were it not for lengthening the discourse and wearying the Reader, I would cite many other of our greatest Divines, who plead for the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, that *Davenant* here expoundeth himself.

But some less judicious grating upon a harsh and unsound sence, Mr. *Anthony Wotton* a very Learned and Godly Divine of *London*, wrote a *Latine* Treatise *de Reconciliatione*, one of the Learnedst that hath ever been written of that subject, in which he laboureth to disprove the rigid Imputation of Christs Holiness and Obedience to man; and sheweth that he is Righteous to whom all sin of Omission and Commission is forgiven; and confuteth these three Assertions. 1. That *A Sinner is Reputed to have fulfilled the Law in and by Christ.* 2. *And being reputed to have fulfilled the Law, is taken for formally just as a fulfiller of it.* 3. *And being formally just as a fullfiller of the Law, Life eternal is due to him by that Covenant*, that saith, *do this and live.* Vid. Part. 2. li. 1. Cap. 11. pag. 152. *Cum sequentibus.* Thus and much further *Mr. Wotton* went to

the very quick of the Controverſie, and irrefragably overthrew the rigid Imputation.

But Mr. *William Bradſhaw*, a Learned Godly Nonconformiſt, being grieved at the differences about the Active and Paſſive Righteouſneſs, and thinking that Mr. *Wotton* denied all Imputation of the Active Righteouſneſs (which he did not, but owneth it to be Imputed as a meritorious Cauſe:) Part. 2. li. 1. Cap. 13. pag. 165. *Ne illud quidem negaverim, imputari nobis illius juſtitiam & obedientiam, ut ad noſtrum fructum redundet: Id unum non concedo, Legem nos in Chriſto & per Chriſtum ſervâſſe, ut propter eam a nobis præſtitam vita æterna ex fœdere, Hoc fac et vives, debeatur.* Mr. *Bradſhaw* I ſay attempted a Conciliatory middle way, which indeed is the ſame in the main with Mr. *Wotton's*: He honoureth the Learned Godly perſons on each ſide, but maintaineth that the Active and Paſſive Righteouſneſs are both Imputed, but not in the rigid ſence of Imputation, denying both theſe Propoſitions. 1. *That Chriſt by the Merits of his Paſſive Obedience only, hath freed us from the guilt of all ſin, both Actual and Original, of Omiſſion and Commiſſion.* 2. *That in the Imputation of Chriſts Obedience both Active and Paſſive, God doth ſo behold and conſider a ſinner in Chriſt, as if the ſinner himſelf had done and ſuffered thoſe very particulars which Chriſt did and ſuffered for him.* And he wrote a ſmall book with great accurateneſs in *Engliſh* firſt, and *Latin* after, opening the nature of Juſtification, which hath been deſervedly applauded ever ſince. His boſom-Friend Mr. *Tho. Gataker*, (a man of rare Learning and Humility) next ſet in to defend Mr. *Bradſhaw's* way, and wrote in *Latin* Animadverſions on *Lucius* (who oppoſed *Piſcator*,

Piſcator, and erred on one ſide for rigid Imputation) and on *Piſcator* who on the other ſide was for Juſtification by the Paſſive Righteouſneſs only; and other things he wrote with great Learning and Judgment in that cauſe.

About that time the Doctrine of perſonal Imputation in the rigid ſence began to be fully improved in *England*, by the Sect of the *Antinomians* (trulyer called *Libertines*) of whom Dr. *Criſpe* was the moſt eminent Ring-leader, whoſe books took wonderfully with ignorant Profeſſors, under the pretence of extolling Chriſt and free-Grace. After him roſe Mr. *Randal*, and Mr. *John Simpſon*, and then Mr. *Town*, and at laſt in the Armies of the Parliament, *Saltinarſh*, and ſo many more, as that it ſeemed to be likely to have carried moſt of the Profeſſors in the Army, and abundance in the City and Country that way: But that ſuddenly (one Novelty being ſet up againſt another) the opinions called *Arminianiſm* roſe up againſt it, and gave it a check and carryed many in the Army and City the clean contrary way: And theſe two Parties divided a great part of the raw injudicious ſort of the profeſſors between them, which uſually are the greateſt part: but eſpecially in the Army which was like to become a Law and example to others.

Before this *John Goodwin* (not yet turned *Arminian*) preached and wrote with great diligence about Juſtification againſt the rigid ſence of Imputation, who being anſwered by Mr. *Walker*, and Mr. *Robourough*, with far inferiour ſtrength, his book had the greater ſucceſs for ſuch anſwerers.

The *Antinomians* then ſwarming in *London*, Mr. *Anthony Burges*, a very worthy Divine was em-

ployed to Preach and Print againſt them; which he did in ſeveral books: but had he been acquainted with the men as I was, he would have found more need to have vindicated the Goſpel againſt them than the Law.

Being daily converſant my ſelf with the *Antinomian* and *Arminian* Souldiers, and hearing their daily conteſts, I thought it pitty that nothing but one extreme ſhould be uſed to beat down that other, and I found the *Antinomian* party far the ſtronger, higher, and more fierce, and working towards greater changes and ſubverſions; And I found that they were juſt falling in with *Saltmarſh*, that *Chriſt hath repented and believed for us, and that we muſt no more queſtion our Faith and Repentance, than Chriſt.* This awakened me better to ſtudy theſe points; And being young, and not furniſhed with ſufficient reading of the Controverſie, and alſo being where were no libraries, I was put to ſtudy only the *naked matter in it ſelf.* Whereupon I ſhortly wrote a ſmall book called *Aphoriſms* of Juſtification, &c. Which contained that Doctrine in ſubſtance which I judg ſound; but being the firſt that I wrote, it had ſeveral expreſſions in it which needed correction; which made me ſuſpend or retract it till I had time to reform them. Mens judgments of it were various, ſome for it and ſome againſt it: I had before been a great eſteemer of two books of one name, *Vindiciæ Gratiæ*, Mr. *Pembles* and Dr. *Twiſſes*, above moſt other books. And from them I had taken in the opinion of a double Juſtification, one *in foro Dei* as an Immanent eternal Act of God, and another *in foro Conſcientiæ*, the Knowledg of that; and I knew no other: But now I ſaw, that neither of

thoſe

thoſe was the Juſtification which the Scripture ſpake of. But ſome half-*Antinomians* which were for the Juſtification before Faith, which I wrote againſt, were moſt angry with my book. And Mr. *Crandon* wrote againſt it, which I anſwered in an *Apologie*, and fullyer wrote my judgment in my *Confeſſion*; and yet more fully in ſome Diſputations of Juſtification againſt Mr. *Burges*, who had in a book of Juſtification made ſome exceptions; and pag. 346. had defended that [*As in Chriſt's ſuffering we were looked upon by God as ſuffering in him; ſo by Chriſts obeying of the Law, we were beheld as fulfilling the Law in him.*] To thoſe Diſputations I never had any anſwer. And ſince then in my *Life of Faith*, I have opened the *Libertine* errours about Juſtification, and ſtated the ſence of Imputation.

Divers writers were then employed on theſe ſubjects: Mr. *Eyers* for Juſtification before Faith (that is, of elect Infidels) and Mr. *Benjamin Woodbridg*, Mr. *Tho. Warren* againſt it. Mr. *Hotchkis* wrote a conſiderable Book of Forgiveneſs of ſin, defending the ſounder way: Mr. *George Hopkins*, wrote to prove that Juſtification and Sanctification are equally carryed on together: Mr. *Warton*, Mr. *Graile*, Mr. *Jeſſop*, (clearing the ſence of Dr. *Twiſſe*,) and many others wrote againſt *Antinomianiſm*. But no man more clearly opened the whole doctrine of Juſtification, than Learned and Pious Mr. *Gibbons* XXX Miniſter at *Black-Fryers*, in a Sermon Printed in the *Lectures* at *St. Giles* in the *Fields*. By ſuch endeavours the before-prevailing *Antinomianiſm* was ſuddenly and ſomewhat marvelouſly ſuppreſſed, ſo that there was no great noiſe made by it.

About Imputation that which I aſſerted was a-

gainst the two fore-described extremes; in short, "That *we are Justified by Christ's whole Righteous-* "*ness*, *Passive*, *Active*, and *Habitual*, yea the *Di-* "*vine* so far included as by *Union* advancing the rest "to a valuable sufficiency: That the Passive, that is, "Christ's whole Humiliation is *satisfactory* first, and "so meritorious, and the Active and Habitual meri- "torious primarily. That as God the Father did "appoint to Christ as Mediator his Duty for our "Redemption by a Law or Covenant, so Christ's "whole fulfilling that Law, or performance of his "Covenant-Conditions as such (by Habitual and "Actual perfection, and by Suffering) made up "one Meritorious Cause of our Justification, not "distinguishing with Mr. *Gataker* of the pure mo- "ral, and the servile part of Christ's Obedience, save "only as one is more a part of Humiliation than the "other, but in point of Merit taking in all: That "as Christ suffered in our stead that we might not "suffer, and obeyed in our nature, that perfection "of Obedience might not be necessary to our *Ju-* "*stification*, and this in the person of a Mediator "and Sponsor for us sinners, but not so in our *Per-* "*sons*, as that we truely in a moral or civil sence, "did all this in and by him; Even so God repu- "teth the thing to be as it is, and so far Imputeth "Christ's Righteousness and Merits and Satisfaction "to us, as that it is Reputed by him the true Me- "ritorious Cause of our Justification; and that for "it God maketh a Covenant of Grace, in which he "freely giveth Christ, Pardon and Life to all that "accept the Gift as it is; so that the Accepters "are by this Covenant or Gift as surely justified "and saved by Christ's Righteousness as if they had

"Obeyed

" Obeyed and Satisfied themselves. Not that Christ " meriteth that we shall have Grace to fulfil the " Law our selves and stand before God in a Righ- " teousness of our own, which will answer the Law " of works and justifie us: But that the Conditi- " ons of the Gift in the Covenant of Grace being " performed by every penitent Believer, that *Cove-* " *nant* doth *pardon* all *their sins* (as Gods Instru- " ment) and giveth them a *Right* to *Life eternal*, " *for Christs Merits.*

This is the sence of Imputation which I and others asserted as the true healing middle way. And as bad as they are, among the most Learned Papists, *Cornelius* a *Lapide* is cited by Mr. *Wotton*, *Vasquez* by *Davenant*, *Suarez* by Mr. *Burges*, as speaking for some such Imputation, and Merit: *Grotius de Satisf.* is clear for it.

But the Brethren called Congregational or Independant in their Meeting at the *Savoy*, *Oct.* 12. 1658. publishing a Declaration of their Faith, *Cap.* 11. have these words [*Those whom God effectually calleth, he also freely justifieth; not by infusing Righteousness into them, but by pardoning their Sins, and by accounting and accepting their persons as Righteous, not for any thing wrought in them, or done by them, but for Christs sake alone: not by imputing Faith it self, the act of believing, or any other evangelical Obedience to them, as their Righteousness; but by Imputing Christs Active Obedience to the whole Law, and Passive Obedience in his death, for their whole and sole Righteousness; they receiving and resting on him and his Righteousness by Faith.*]

Upon the publication of this it was variously spoken of: some thought that it gave the *Papists* so

ſo great a ſcandal, and advantage to reproach the *Proteſtants* as denying all inherent Righteouſneſs, that it was neceſſary that we ſhould diſclaim it: Others ſaid that it was not their meaning to deny Inherent Righteouſneſs, though their words ſo ſpake, but only that we are not juſtified by it: Many ſaid that it was not the work of all of that party, but of ſome few that had an inclination to ſome of the *Antinomian* principles, out of a miſtaken zeal of free Grace; and that it is well known that they differ from us, and therefore it cannot be imputed to us, and that it is beſt make no ſtir about it, leſt it irritate them to make the matter worſe by a Defence, & give the Papiſts too ſoon notice of it. And I ſpake with one Godly Miniſter that was of their Aſſembly, who told me, that they did not ſubſcribe it, and that they meant but to deny Juſtification by inherent Righteouſneſs. And though ſuch men in the Articles of their declared Faith, no doubt can ſpeak intelligibly and aptly, and are to be underſtood as they ſpeak according to the common uſe of the words; yet even able-men ſometimes may be in this excepted, when eager engagement in an opinion and parties, carryeth them too precipitantly, and maketh them forget ſomething, that ſhould be remembred. The Sentences here which we excepted againſt are theſe two. But the firſt was not much offenſive becauſe their meaning was right; *And the ſame words are in the Aſſemblies Confeſſion, though they might better have been left out.*

Scrip-

Scriptures.	*Declaration.*
Rom. 4.3. What saith the Scripture ? *Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for Righteousness.*	[1 Not by imputing Faith it self, part of Believing, or any other Evangelical Obedience to them as their Righteousness]

Ver. 5. *To him that worketh not, but believeth on him that Justifyeth the Ungodly, his* Faith *is counted for Righteousness.*

Ver. 9. *For we say that* Faith *was reckoned to Abraham for Righteousness: How was it then reckoned?*

Ver. 11. *And he received the sign of Circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the Faith, which he had yet being uncircumcised, that he might be the Father of all them that believe,——that Righteousness might be imputed to them also.* —— Ver 13. *Through the Righteousness of Faith.* —— Ver. 16. *Therefore it is of Faith that it might be by Grace.* —— vid. Ver. 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24. *He was strong in Faith, fully perswaded that what he had promised, he was able also to perform; and therefore it was Imputed to him for Righteousness. Now it was not written for his sake alone that it was imputed to him, but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we* (or, who) believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead.

Gen. 15. 5,6. *Tell the Stars ——so shall thy seed be: And he believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for Righteousness,* Jam. 2. 21, 22, 23, 24. Was not *Abraham* our Father justified, by Works ?—— And the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, *Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for Righteousness.*

Luk.

Luk. 19. 17. *Well done thou good Servant, Because thou hast been Faithful in a very little, have thou authority over ten Cities.*

Mat. 25. 34, 35, 40, *Come ye blessed.* —— *For I was hungry and ye gave me Meat.*

Gen. 22. 16, 17, *By my self I have sworn.* —— *Because thou hast done this thing.* ——

Joh. 16. 27. *For the Father himself loveth you, because you have loved me and have believed that I came out from God.* Many such passages are in Scripture.

Our opinion is, 1. That it is better to justifie and expound the Scripture, than flatly to deny it: If Scripture so oft say, that *Faith* is *reckoned* or *Imputed* for *Righteousness*, it becometh not Christians, to say, *It is not*: But to shew in what sence it is, and in what it is not. For if it be so Imputed in *no sence*, the Scripture is made false: If in any sence, it should not be universally denied but with distinction.

2. We hold, that in Justification there is considerable, 1. The Purchasing and Meritorious Cause of Justification freely given in the new Covenant. This is only Christ's Sufferings and Righteousness, and so it is Reputed of God, and Imputed to us. 2. The *Order of Donation*, which is, On *Condition of Acceptance*; And so 3. The Condition of our *Title* to the free Gift by this Covenant; And that is, Our Faith, or Acceptance of the Gift according to its nature and use. And thus God Reputeth Faith, and Imputeth it to us, requiring but this *Condition of us* (which also he worketh in us) by the Covenant of Grace; whereas perfect Obedience

dience *was required of us*, by the Law of Innocency.

If we err in this explication, it had been better to confute us than deny God's Word.

Scriptures besides the former. *Declaration.*

1 Joh. 2. 29. *Every one which doth Righteousness is born of God.* —— & 3. 7, 10. *He that doth Righteousness is Righteous, even as he is Righteous.* —— *Whosoever doth not righteousness is not of God.* [2 For their sole Righteousness.]

2 Tim. 4. 8. *He hath laid up for us a Crown of Righteousness.*

Heb. 11. 23. *Through Faith they wrought Righteousness.* —— Heb. 12. *The peaceable fruit of Righteousness.* —— Jam. 3. 18. *The fruit of Righteousness is sown in Peace.* —— 1 Pet. 2. 24. *That we being dead to sin, should live unto righteousness,* Mat 5. 20. *Except your Righteousness exceed the Righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, &c.* —— Luk. 1. 71. *In Holiness and Righteousness before him all the days of our Life.* —— Act. 10. 35. *He that feareth God, and worketh Righteousness is accepted of him,* —— Rom. 6. 13, 16, 18, 19, 20. *Whether of sin unto death, or of Obedience unto Righteousness.* —— 1 Cor. 15. 34. *Awake to Righteousness and sin not.* —— Eph. 5. 9. *The fruit of the Spirit is in all Goodness, and Righteousness.* —— Dan. 12. 3. *They shall turn many to Righteousness.* —— Dan. 4. 27. *Break off thy sins by Righteousness.* —— Eph. 4. 24. *The new-man which after God is created in Righteousness.* —— Gen. 7. 1. *Thee have I seen Righteous before me.* —— Gen. 18. 23, 24, 25, 26. *Far be it from thee, to destroy the Righteous with the Wicked.* —— Prov. 24. 24. *He that*

that saith to the Wicked thou art Righteous, him shall the people Curse, Nations shall abhor him. —— Isa. 3. 10. *Say to the Righteous, it shall be well with him,* Isa. 5. 23. *That take away the Righteousness from the Righteous.* —— Mat. 25. 37, 46. *Then shall the Righteous answer.* —— *The Righteous into life eternal.* —— Luk. 1. 6. *They were both Righteous before God.* —— Heb. 11. 4, 7. *By Faith* Abel *offered to God a more excellent Sacrifice than* Cain, *by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his Gifts. By Faith* Noah *being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an Ark,* —— *by which he became heir of the Righteousness by Faith,* 1 Pet. 4. 18. *If the Righteous be scarcely saved.* —— Math. 10. 41. *He that receiveth a Righteous man in the name of a Righteous man, shall have a Righteous mans reward.* —— 1 Tim. 1. 9. *The Law is not made for a Righteous man, but for* —— Many score of texts more mention a Righteousness distinct from that of Christ imputed to us.

Judg now, Whether he that believeth God should believe that he Imputeth Christs Obedience and Suffering to us, [for our *Sole Righteousness,*]

That which is not our *sole Righteousness,* is not so Reputed by God nor Imputed: But Christs Obedience and Suffering is not our *sole Righteousness.* —— See *Davenant's* many arguments to prove that we have an Inherent Righteousness.

Obj. *But,* they mean, [*our Sole Righteousness by which we are Justified.*]

Answ. 1. We can tell no mans meaning but by his words, especially not contrary to them, especially in an accurate Declaration of Faith. 2. Suppose it had been so said, we maintain on the contrary, 1. That

That we are Justified by more sorts of Righteousnes than one, in several respects. We are justified *only by Christs Righteousnes* as the Purchasing and Meritorious Cause of our Justification freely given by that new Covenant. We are Justified by the Righteousnes of God the Father, as performing his Covenant with Christ and us, (efficiently). We are justified efficiently by the Righteousnes of Christ as our Judg, passing a just sentence according to his Covenant: These last are neither *Ours* nor Imputed to us: But we are justified also against the Accusation, of being finally Impenitent Unbelievers or unholy, by the personal particular Righteousnes of our own Repentance, *Faith and Holiness*.

For 2. We say, that there is an universal Justification or Righteousnes, and there is a particular one. And this *particular* one may be the *Condition* and *Evidence* of our Title to all the rest. And this is our case. The Day of Judgment is not to try and *Judg Christ*, or *his Merits*, *but us*: He will judg us himself by his new Law or Covenant, the sum of which is, [*Except ye Repent, ye shall all perish: and, He that believeth, shall be saved: and he that believeth not, shall be condemned.* If we be not accused of *Impenitence* or *Unbelief*, but only of *not-fulfilling the Law of Innocency*, that will suppose that we are to be *tryed* only by *that Law*, which is not true: And then we *refer the Accuser only to Christ's Righteousnes*, and to the *Pardoning Law of Grace*, and to nothing in our selves to answer that charge; And so it would be *Christ's part* only that would be judged. But *Matth.* 25. and all the Scripture assureth us of the contrary, that it's *Our part that it is to be tryed* and *judged*, and that we shall

ſhall be all judged according to what we have done. And no man is in danger there of any other accuſation, but that he did not truly *Repent* and *Believe*, and live *a holy life to Chriſt*: And ſhall the *Penitent Believer* ſay, *I did never Repent and Believe, but Chriſt did it for me*; and ſo uſe *two Lyes*, one of Chriſt, and another of himſelf, that he may be juſtified? Or ſhall the *Unholy, Impenitent Infidel* ſay, It's true I was never a *Penitent Believer, or holy*, but Chriſt was for me, or Chriſts Righteouſneſs is my ſole Righteouſneſs? that is a faſhood; For Chriſts Righteouſneſs is none of his. So that there is a *particular perſonal Righteouſneſs*, conſiſting in *Faith and Repentance*, which by way of *Condition* and *Evidence* of our title to Chriſt and his Gift of Pardon and Life, is of abſolute neceſſity in our Juſtification. Therefore Imputed Righteouſneſs is not the *ſole Righteouſneſs* which muſt juſtifie us.

I cited abundance of plain Texts to this purpoſe in my Confeſſion, pag. 57. &c. Of which book I add, that when it was in the preſs, I procured thoſe three perſons whom I moſt highly valued for judgment, Mr. *Gataker*, (whoſe laſt work it was in this World) Mr. *Vines*, and laſtly Arch-Biſhop *Uſher* to read it over, except the Epiſtles (Mr. *Gataker* read only to *pag.* 163.) and no one of them adviſed me to alter one word, nor ſignified their diſſent to any word of it. But I have been long on this: to proceed in the Hiſtory. ——

The ſame year that I wrote that book, that moſt Judicious excellent man *Joſhua Placæus* of *Saumours* in *France*, was exerciſed in a Controverſie conjunct with this; How far *Adams* ſin is imputed to us. And to ſpeak truth, at firſt in the *Theſes Salmurienſ.*

Vol. 1. he seemed plainly to dispute against the Imputation of *Adam's* actual sin, and his arguments I elsewhere answer.) And *Andr. Rivet* wrote a Collection of the Judgment of all sorts of Divines for the contrary. But after he vindicated himself, & shewed that his Doctrine was, that *Adam*'s *fact* is not *immediately* imputed to each of us, as if our *persons* as *persons* had been all fully represented in *Adam's* person (by an arbitrary Law or Will of God) or reputed so to be: But that our Persons being *Virtually* or *Seminally* in *him*, we derive from him first our *Persons*, and in them a corrupted nature, and that nature corrupted and justly deserted by the Spirit of God, because it is derived from *Adam* that so sinned: And so that *Adams* fact is imputed to us mediately, *mediante natura & Corruptione*, but not primarily and immediately.

This doctrine of the Good and Judicious man was thought too new to escape sharp censures, so that a rumour was spread abroad that he denied all Imputation of *Adams* fact, and placed original guilt only in the Guilt of Coruption, for which indeed he gave occasion. A Synod being called at *Charenton*, this opinion without naming any Author was condemned; & all Ministers required to subscribe it: *Amyraldus* being of *Placeus* mind, in a speech of two hours vindicated his opinion. *Placeus* knowing that the Decree did not touch him, took no notice of it. But *Gerissolius* of *Montauban* wrote against him, pretending him condemned by the Decree, which *Drelincourt* one that drew it up, denied, professing himself of *Placeus* his judgment. And *Rivet* also, *Maresius*, *Carol. Daubuz* and others, misunderstanding him wrote against him.

For my part I confess that I am not satisfied in his distinction of *Mediate* and *Immediate Imputation:* I see not, but our *Persons* as derived from *Adam*, being supposed to be in Being, we are at once Reputed to be such as Virtually sinned in him, and such as are deprived of God's Image. And if either must be put first, me-thinks it should rather be the former, we being therefore deprived of God's Image (not by God, but by *Adam*) because he sinned it away from himself. It satisfieth me much more, to distinguish of our *Being* and so *sinning* in *Adam Personally* and *Seminally*, or *Virtually*: we were not *Persons* in *Adam* when he sinned; therefore we did not so sin in him: And it is a fiction added to God's Word, to say that God (because he would do it) reputed us to be what we were not. But we were Seminally in *Adam* as in *Causâ naturali*, who was to produce us out of his very essence: And therefore that kind of being which we had in him, could not be innocent when he was guilty: And when we had our *Natures* and *Persons* from him, we are justly reputed to be as we are, the offspring of one that actually sinned: And so when our *Existence* and *Personality* maketh us capable Subjects, we are guilty *Persons* of his sin; though not with so *plenary a sort of Guilt as he*.

And I fear not to say, that as I lay the ground of this Imputation in Nature it self, so I doubt not but I have elsewhere proved that there is more participation of all Children in the guilt of their parents sins by nature, than is sufficiently acknowledged or lamented by most, though Scripture abound with the proof of it: And that the overlooking it, and laying all upon God's arbitrary Covenant

venant and Imputation, is the great temptation to *Pelagians* to deny Original sin: And that our misery no more increaseth by it, is, because we are now under a Covenant that doth not so charge all culpability on mankind, as the Law of Innocency did alone. And there is something of Pardon in the Case. And the *English Litany*, (after *Ezra*, *Daniel* and others) well prayeth, Remember not, Lord, our offences, nor the offences of our Forefathers, *&c.*

This same *Placeus* in *Thes. Salmurienf. Vol.* 1. hath opened the doctrine of Justification so fully, that I think that one Disputation might spare some the reading of many contentious Volumes.

The rigid assertors of Imputation proved such a stumbling-block to many, that they run into the other extreme, and not only denyed it, but vehemently loaded it with the Charges of over-throwing all Godliness and Obedience. Of these *Parker* (as is said) with some others wrote against it in an answer to the Assemblies Confession: Dr. *Gell* often reproacheth it in a large Book in *Folio*. And lastly and most sharply and confidently *Herbert Thorndike*, (to mention no more.)

The History of this Controversie of Imputation, I conclude, though disorderly, with the sense of all the Christian Churches, in the Creeds and Harmony of Confessions, because they were too long to be fitly inserted by the way.

The Consent of Christians, and specially Protestants, about the Imputation of Christs Righteousness in Justification; How far and in what sence it is Imputed.

I. SEeing *Baptism* is our visible initiation into Christianity, we must there begin; and see what of this is there contained. Mat. 28. 19. *Baptizing them into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost*, Mar. 16. 16. *He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved*, Act 2. 38. *Repent, and be Baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the Remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.* See Acts 8. 36, 37, 38. The Eunuch's Faith and Baptism. Act. 22. 16. *Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, having called on the name of the Lord.* Rom. 6. 3. *So many as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death.* Gal. 3. 27. *As many as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.* 1. Pet. 3. 21. *The like whereunto, Baptism doth also now save us, (not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good Conscience towards God) by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ.* Rom. 4. 24, 25. *But for us also to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead: who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our Justification.* [Quær. *How far Christ's Resurrection is imputed to us.*]

II. The Creed, called by the Apostles, hath but [*I believe —— the forgiveness of sins.*]

III. The Nicene and Constantinopolitane Creed,

I acknowledg one Baptism for the Remission of sins; (Christ's Death, Burial, and Resurrection premised.)

IV. Athanasius's Creed [*Who suffered for our Salvation, descended into Hell, rose again the third day.* —— *At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies, and shall give account for their own works*; *and they that have done good, shall go into everlasting life, and they that have done evil into everlasting Fire.*] (*Remission* is contained in *Salvation.*)

V. The Fathers sence I know not where the Reader can so easily and surely gather, without reading them all, as in *Laurentius* his Collection *de Justif.* after the *Corpus Confessionum*; and that to the best advantage of the Protestant Cause. They that will see their sence of so much as they accounted necessary to Salvation, may best find it in their Treatises of Baptism, and Catechizings of the Catechumens; Though they say less about our Controversie than I could wish they had. I will have no other Religion than they had. The Creed of *Damasus* in *Hieron. op. Tom.* 2. hath but (*In his Death and Blood we believe that we are cleansed* —— *and have hope that we shall obtain the reward of good merit*, (meaning our own); which the *Helvetians* own in the end of their Confession.

VI. The Augustane Confession, Art. 3, 4. *Christ died* —— *that he might reconcile the Father to us, and be a sacrifice, not only for original sin, but also for all the actual sins of men.* —— *And that we may obtain these benefits of Christ, that is, Remission of sins, justification and life eternal, Christ gave us the Gospel in which these benefits are propounded.* —— *To preach*

Repentance in his Name, and Remiſſion of ſins among all Nations. For when men propagated in the natural manner have ſin, and cannot truly ſatisfie Gods Law, the Goſpel reproveth ſin, and ſheweth us Chriſt the Mediator, and ſo teacheth us about Pardon of ſins——That freely for Chriſt's ſake are given us, Remiſſion of ſins, & Juſtification by Faith, by which we muſt confeſs that theſe are given us for Chriſt, who was made a Sacrifice for us, and appeaſed the Father. Though the Goſpel require Penitence; yet that pardon of ſin may be ſure, it teacheth us that it is freely given us; that is, that it dependeth not on the Condition of our worthyneſs, nor is given for any precedent works, or worthyneſs of following works. —— For Conſcience in true fears findeth no work which it can oppoſe to the Wrath of God; and Chriſt is propoſed and given us, to be a propitiator. This honour of Chriſt muſt not be transferred to our works. Therefore Paul *ſaith, ye are ſaved freely, (or of Grace.) And it is of grace, that the promiſe might be ſure; that is, Pardon will be ſure; when we know that it dependeth not on the Condition of our worthineſs, but is given for Chriſt. —— In the Creed this Article, [I believe the Forgiveneſs of ſins,] is added to the hiſtory: And the reſt of the hiſtory of Chriſt muſt be referred to this Article: For this benefit is the end of the hiſtory, Chriſt therefore ſuffered and roſe again, that for him might be given us Remiſſion of ſins, and life everlaſting.*

Art. 6. *When we are Reconciled by Faith, there muſt needs follow the Righteouſneſs of good works.—— But becauſe the infirmity of mans nature is ſo great, that no man can ſatisfie the Law, it is neceſſary to teach men, not only that they muſt obey the Law, but alſo how this Obedience pleaſeth, leſt Conſciences fall into*

into desperation, when they understand that they satisfie not the Law. This Obedience then pleaseth, not because it satisfieth the Law, but because the person is in Christ, reconciled by Faith, and believeth that the relicts of his Sin are pardoned. We must ever hold that we obtain remission of sins, and the person is pronounced Righteous, that is, is accepted freely for Christ, by Faith: And afterward that Obedience to the Law pleaseth, and is reputed a certain Righteousness, and meriteth rewards.] Thus the first Protestants.

VII. The 11th Article of the Church of England (to which we all offer to subscribe) is [*Of the Justification of Man. We are accounted Righteous before God, only for the Merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by Faith; and not for our own works or deservings. Wherefore that we are justified by Faith only, is a most wholsome doctrine, and very full of Comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification.*]

The said Homilies (of Salvation and Faith) say over and over the same thing. As pag. 14. [*Three things go together in our Justification: On Gods part his great Mercy and Grace, on Christs part, Justice, that is, the Satisfaction of Gods Justice, or the Price of our Redemption, by the offering of his body, and shedding of his blood, with fulfilling of the Law perfectly and throughly; And on our part true and lively Faith in the Merits of Jesus Christ: which yet is not ours, but by Gods working in us.*

And pag. [*A lively Faith is not only the common belief of the Articles of our Faith, but also a true trust and confidence of the mercy of God through our Lord Jesus Christ, and a steadfast hope of all good things to be received at Gods hand; and that although we through*

infirmity or temptation —— do fall from him by sin, yet if we return again to him by true repentance, that he will forgive and forget our offences, for his Sons sake our Saviour Jesus Christ, and will make us inheritors with him of his everlasting Kingdom —— Pag. 23. *For the very sure and lively Christian Faith, is, to have an earnest trust and confidence in God, that he doth regard us, and is careful over us, as the Father is over the Child whom he doth love; and that he will be merciful unto us, for his only Sons sake; and that we have our Saviour Christ our perpetual Advocate and Prince, in whose only merits, oblation and suffering, we do trust that our offences be continually washed and purged, whensoever we repenting truely do return to him with our whole heart, steadfastly determining with our selves, through his grace to obey and serve him, in keeping his Commandments, &c.*] So also the Apology. This is our doctrine of Imputation.

VIII. The Saxon Confession oft insisteth on the *free Pardon of sin, not merited by us, but by Christ.* And expoundeth *Justification* to be [*Of unjust, that is, Guilty and disobedient, and not having Christ: to be made Just, that is, To be Absolved from Guilt for the Son of God, and an apprehender by Faith of Christ himself, who is our Righteousness*; (as *Jeremiah* and *Paul* say) *because by his Merit we have forgiveness, and God imputeth righteousness to us, and for him, reputeth us just, and by giving us his Spirit quickeneth and regenerateth us.* —— *By being Justified by Faith alone we mean, that freely for our Mediator alone, not for our Contrition, or other Merits, the pardon of sin and reconciliation is given us.* —— *And before, It is certain, when the mind is raised by this Faith, that the pardon of sin, Reconciliation and Imputation of Righte-*

ousness

ouſneſs, are given for the Merit of Chriſt himſelf —. And after [*By Faith is meant Affiance, reſting in the Son of God the Propitiator, for whom we are received and pleaſe* (God) *and not for our virtues and fulfilling of the Law.*

IX. The Wittenberge Confeſſion, (In Corp. Conf. pag. 104) *A man is made Accepted of God, and Reputed juſt before him, for the Son of God our Lord Jeſus Chriſt alone, by Faith. And at the Judgment of God we muſt not truſt to the Merit of any of the Virtues which we have, but to the ſole Merit of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, which is made ours by Faith. And becauſe at the bar of God, where the caſe of true eternal Righteouſneſs and Salvation will be pleaded, there is no place for mans Merits, but only for God's Mercy, and the Merits of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, whom we receive by Faith: therefore we think our Anceſtors ſaid rightly, that we are juſtified before God by Faith only.*

X. The Bohemian Confeſſion, making Juſtification the principal Article, goeth the ſame way. [Pag. 183, 184. *By Chriſt men are Juſtified, obtain Salvation and Remiſſion of ſin, freely by Faith in Chriſt, through mercy, without any Work, and Merit of man. And his death and blood alone is ſufficient, to aboliſh & expiate all the ſins of all men. All muſt come to Chriſt for pardon and Remiſſion of Sin, Salvation and every thing. All our truſt and hope is to be faſtened on him alone. Through him only and his merits God is appeaſ'd and propitious, Loveth us, and giveth us Life eternal.*

XI. The Palatinate Confeſſion, ib. pag. 149. [*I believe that God the Father for the moſt full Satisfaction of Chriſt, doth never remember any of my ſins, and that pravity which I muſt ſtrive againſt while I live, but contrarily will rather of grace give me the righteouſ-*

neſs

neſs of Chriſt, ſo that I have no need to fear the judgment of God. —— *And* pag. 155. *If he merited, and obtained Remiſſion of all our ſins, by the only and bitter paſſion, and death of the Croſs, ſo be it we embracing it by true Faith, as the ſatisfaction for our ſins, apply it to our ſelves.* ——] I find no more of this.

XII. The Polonian Churches of Lutherans and Bohemians agreed in the Auguſtane and Bohemian Confeſſion before recited.

XIII. The Helvetian Confeſſion, [*To Juſtifie ſignifieth to the Apoſtle in the diſpute of Juſtification, To Remit ſins, to Abſolve from the fault and puniſhment, to Receive into favour, and to Pronounce juſt.*—— *For Chriſt took on himſelf, and took away the ſins of the World, and ſatisfied Gods Juſtice. God therefore for the ſake of Chriſt alone, ſuffering and raiſed again, is propitious to our ſins, and imputeth them not to us, but imputeth the righteouſneſs of Chriſt for ours; ſo that now we are not only cleanſed and purged from ſins, or Holy, but alſo endowed with the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, and ſo abſolved from ſins, Death and Condemnation, and are righteous and heirs of life eternal. Speaking properly, God only juſtifieth us, and juſtifieth only for Chriſt, not imputing to us ſins, but imputing to us his Righteouſneſs.*] This Confeſſion ſpeaketh in terms neereſt the oppoſed opinion: But indeed faith no more than we all ſay; Chriſts Righteouſneſs being given and imputed to us as the *Meritorious Cauſe of our pardon and right to life.*

XIV. The Baſil Confeſſion, Art. 9. [*We confeſs Remiſſion of ſins by Faith in Jeſus Chriſt crucified. And though this Faith work continually by Love, yet Righteouſneſs and Satisfaction for our Sins, we do not attribute to works, which are fruits of Faith; but only*

ly to true affiance & faith in the blood shed of the Lamb of God. We ingenuously profess, that in Christ, who is our Righteousness, Holiness, Redemption, Way, Truth, Wisdom, Life, all things are freely given us. The works therefore of the faithful are done, not that they may satisfie for their sins, but only that by them, they may declare that they are thankful to God for so great benefits given us in Christ.

XV. The Argentine Confession of the four Cities, Cap. 3. ib. pag. 179. hath but this hereof: *When heretofore they delivered, that a mans own proper Works are required to his Justification, we teach that this is to be acknowledged wholly received of God's benevolence and Christ's Merit, and perceived only by Faith.* C. 4. *We are sure that no man can be made Righteous or saved, unless he love God above all, and most studiously imitate him. We can no otherwise be Justified, that is, become both Righteous and Saved (for our Righteousness is our very Salvation) than if we being first indued with Faith, by which believing the Gospel, and perswaded that God hath adopted us as Sons, and will for ever give us his fatherly benevolence, we wholly depend on his beck (*or will.*)*

XVI. The Synod of Dort, mentioneth only Christs death for the pardon of sin and Justification. The Belgick Confession, § 22. having mentioned Christ and his merits made ours, § 23. addeth, [*We believe that our blessedness consisteth in Remission of our sins for Jesus Christ; and that our Righteousness before God is therein contained, as* David *and* Paul *teach; We are justified freely, or by Grace, through the Redemption that is in Christ Jesus. We hold this Foundation firm, and give all the Glory to God—presuming nothing of our selves, and our merits, but*

but we rest on the sole Obedience of a Crucified Christ; which is ours when we believe in him.] Here you see in what sence they hold that Christs merits are ours; Not to justifie us by the Law, that saith, (*Obey perfectly and Live*) but as the merit of our *pardon*, which they here take for their whole Righteousness.

XVII. The Scottish Confession, Corp. Conf. pag. 125. hath but [that true Believers *receive in this life Remission of Sins, and that by Faith alone in Christs blood: So that though sin remain —— yet it is not Imputed to us, but is remitted, and covered by Christs Righteousness.*] This is plain and past all question.

XVIII. The French Confession is more plain, § 18. ib. pag. 81. [*We believe that our whole Righteousness lyeth in the pardon of our sins; which is also as* David *witnesseth our only blessedness. Therefore all other reasons by which men think to be justified before God, we plainly reject; and all opinion of Merit being cast away; we rest only in the Obedience of Christ, which is Imputed to us, both that all our sins may be covered, and that we may get Grace before God.*] So that Imputation of Obedience, they think is but for *pardon of sin, and acceptance.*

Concerning Protestants Judgment of Imputation, it is further to be noted; 1. That they are not agreed whether Imputation of Christ's perfect Holiness and Obedience, be before or after the Imputation of his Passion in order of nature. Some think that our sins are first in order of nature done away by the Imputation of his sufferings, that we may be free from punishment; and next, that his *perfection* is Imputed to us, to merit the Reward of life eternal: But the most learned Confuters of the Papists

pists hold, that Imputation of Christs *Obedience* and *Suffering* together, are in order of nature before our Remission of sin and Acceptance, as the meritorious cause: And these can mean it in no other sence than that which I maintain. So doth *Davenant* de Just. hab. et act. & Pet. Molinæus Thes. Sedan. Vol. 1. pag. 625. *Imputatio justitiæ Christi propter quam peccata remittuntur, & censemur justi coram Deo.* Maresius Thes. Sedan. Vol. 2. pag. 770, 771. § 6 & 10. *maketh the material cause of our Justification to be the Merits and Satisfaction of Christ, yea the Merit of his Satisfaction, and so maketh the formal Cause of Justification to be the Imputation of Christs Righteousness, or which is the same, the solemn Remission of all sins, and our free Acceptance with God.* Note that he maketh *Imputation* to be the same thing with *Remission and Acceptance*; which is more than the former said.

2. Note, that when they say that Imputation is the *Form* of Justification, they mean not of Justification Passively as it is ours, but Actively as it is *Gods Justifying act*; so *Maresius ibidem.* And many deny it to be the form: And many think that saying improper.

3. Note, that it is ordinarily agreed by Protestants, that Christs Righteousness is imputed to us in the same sence as our sins are said to be imputed to him; (even before they are committed many Ages;) which cleareth fully the whole Controversie to those that are but willing to understand, and blaspheme not Christ; so *Maresius ubi supra: Quemadmodum propter deliquia nostra ei imputata punitus fuit Christus in terris; ita & propter ejus Justitiam nobis imputatam coronamur in Cælis.* And *Job. Crocius*

Crocius Disput. 10. p. 502. And *Vasseur* in his solid Disp. *Thes. Sedan. Vol.* 2. pag. 1053, 1054. While he mentioneth only *Satisfaction* for our Justification, yet § 27. saith that *Satisfaction* is *imputed to us*, and placeth Christs Imputed Righteousness in his Obedience *to the* death; and saith that this *satisfying Obedience*, *in suffering*, is our Imputed Righteousness. *Ea igitur Obedientia Christi qua Patri paruit usque ad mortem crucis, qua coram Patre comparuit ut voluntatem ejus perficeret, qua a Patre missus, ut nos sui sanguinis effusione redimeret, justitiæ ejus pro peccatis nostris abunde satisfecit; ea inquam obedientia ex gratia Patris imputata & donata, illa justitia est qua justificamur.* And they ordinarily use the similitude of the Redemption of a Captive, and Imputing the Price to him. He addeth (*Hence we may gather that as Christ was made sin, so we are made the Righteousness of God, that is by Imputation*] which is true.

The plain truth in all this is within the reach of every sound Christian, and self-conceited wranglers make difficulties where there are none. Yea, how far the Papists themselves grant the Protestant doctrine of Imputation, let the following words of *Vasseur* on *Bellarmine* be judg. [*Bellarm. ait; Si solum vellent hæretici nobis imputari Merita Christi, quia nobis donata sunt, & possumus ea Deo Patri offerre pro peccatis nostris, quoniam Christus suscepit super se onus satisfaciendi pro nobis, nosque Deo Patri reconciliandi, recta esset eorum Sententia*: I doubt some will say, it is false, because *Bellarmine* granteth it; but *Vasseur* addeth [*Hæc ille: sed an nostra longe abest ab illâ, quam in nobis requireret sententia.*] And I wish the Reader that loveth Truth and Peace

to

to read the words of *Pighius*, *Caſſander*, *Bellarmine*, *&c.* ſaying as the Proteſtants, cited by *Joh. Crocius de Juſtificat. Diſput. 9. pag.* 458. *&c.* And of *Morton Apolog.* eſpecially *Tho. Waldenſis.*

Nazianzen's ſentence prefixed by the great *Baſil*-Doctors to their Confeſſion, I do affectionately recite, [*Sacred Theologie and Religion is a ſimple and naked thing; conſiſting of Divine Teſtimonies, without any great artifice: which yet ſome do naughtily turn into a moſt difficult Art.*

The Hiſtory of the *Socinians* oppoſing Chriſts *Satisfaction* and *Merits* I overpaſs, as being handled by multitudes of Writers.

If any impartial man would not be troubled with needleſs tedious writings, and yet would ſee the Truth clearly, about Juſtification and Imputation, in a very little room, let him read, 1. Mr. *Bradſhaw*, 2. Mr. *Gibbon's* Sermon in the Exerciſes at *Giles's* in the Fields. 3. Mr. *Truman's* great Propitiation. 4. *Joſhua Placeus*, his *Diſput. de Juſtif.* in *Theſ. Salmur. Vol.* 1. 5. And *Le Blanc's* late *Theſes*; Which will ſatisfie thoſe that have any juſt capacity for ſatisfaction. And if he add *Wotton de Reconciliatione*, and *Grotius de Satisfactione*, he need not loſe his labour: no nor by reading *John Goodwin* of Juſtification, though every word be not approveable. And Dr. *Stillingfleet's* Sermons of Satisfaction, coming laſt, will alſo conduce much to his juſt information.

So much of the Hiſtorical part.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Of the true ſtating of the Controverſie, and the explication of the ſeveral points contained or meerly implyed in it.

I take explication to be here more uſeful than argumentation: And therefore I ſhall yet fullier open to you the ſtate of our differences, and my own judgment in the point, with the reaſons of it, in ſuch neceſſary Diſtinctions, and brief Propoſitions, as ſhall carry their own convincing light with them. If any think I diſtinguiſh too much, let him prove any to be needleſs *or* unjuſt, *and then reject it and ſpare not. If any think I diſtinguiſh not accurately enough, let him add what is wanting, and but ſuppoſe that I have elſewhere done it, and am not now handling the whole doctrine of Juſtification, but only that of Imputation, and what it neceſſarily includeth.*

THough a man that readeth our moſt Learned Proteſtants, profeſſing that they agree even with *Bellarmine* himſelf in the ſtating of the caſe of Imputation, would think that there ſhould need no further ſtating of it. I cited you *Bellarmine's* words

words before with *Vasseurs* consent: I here add Johan. Crocius de Justif. Disp. 10. pag. 500. 501. *Vide hominis sive vertiginem sive improbitatem, clamat fieri non posse ut Justitia Christi nobis imputetur eo sensu qui hæreticis probetur —— Et tamen rectam vocat sententiam, quam suam faciunt Evangelici. Quod enim cum rectâ ratione pugnare dicit, nos per Justitiam Christi formaliter justos nominari & esse, nos non tangit: Non dicimus; Non sentimus: Sed hoc totum proficiscitur e Sophistarum officinâ, qui phrasin istam nobis affingunt, ut postea eam exagitent tanquam nostram:* (yet some of our own give them this pretence.) *Nos sententiam quam ille rectam judicat, tenemus, tuemur; sic tamen ut addamus, quod Genti adversariæ est intolerabile, non alia ratione nos justos censeri coram Deo.*] But by Justification the Papists mean Sanctification: And they count it not intolerable to say that the penalty of our sins is remitted to us, by that Satisfaction to the Justice of God according to the Law of Innocency, which Christ only hath made. But though many thrust in more indeed, and most of them much more in words; yet you see they are forced to say as we say whether they will or not: For they seem unwilling to be thought to agree with us, where they agree indeed.] And the following words of *Joh. Crocius pag.* 506, 507. *&c.* shew the common sence of most Protestants, [*When* Bellarmine *observeth that Imputation maketh us as righteous as Christ*, he saith, [*If we said that we are Justified by Christs essential righteousness.* —— *But we say it not. Yea above all we renounce that which the Sophister puts in of his own, even that which he saith of Formal Righteousness: For it is not our opinion, that we are constituted formally Righteous by*

Christ's

Christ's Righteousness, which we rather call the Material cause. —— § 32. *Christs satisfaction is made for all : But it is imputed to us, not as it is made for all, but as for us. I illustrate it by the like. The Kings Son payeth the debt of a Community deeply indebted to the King, and thence bound to perpetual slavery. This payment gets liberty for this, and that, and the other member of the Community : For it is imputed to them by the King as if they had paid it. But this Imputation transferreth not the honour to them, but brings them to partake of the Benefit. So when the price paid by Christ for all, is imputed to this or that man, he is taken into the society of the Benefit,* —— Pag. 503. *Distinguish between the Benefit, and the Office of Christ. The former is made ours, but not the latter,* ——Pag. 542. *The Remission of sin is nothing but the Imputation of Christs Righteousness.* Rom. 4. *Where Imputation of Righteousness, Remission of Iniquities, and non-imputation of sin, are all one,* —— Pag. 547. *God imputeth it as far as he pleaseth,* —— Pag. 548. *Princes oft impute the merits of Parents so unworthy Children,* —— Pag. 551. He denyeth that we have *Infinite Righteousness in Christ, because it is imputed to us in a finite manner, even so far as was requisite to our absolution.*

But I will a little more distinctly open and resolve the Case.

1. We must distinguish of *Righteousness* as it relateth to the Preceptive part of the Law ; and as it relateth to the Retributive part : The first *Righteousness*, is *Innocency* contrary to *Reatus Culpæ* : The second is *Jus ad impunitatem & ad præmium (seu donum,) Right to Impunity and to the Reward.*

2. We must distinguish of *Christs Righteousness*, which

which is either so called, *formally* and *properly*, which is the *Relation of Christs person* to his *Law of Mediation* imposed on him, 1. As *Innocent* and a perfect obeyer; 2. As one that *deserved not punishment, but deserved Reward.* Or it is so called *materially* and *improperly*; which is, Those *same Habits, Acts and Sufferings* of Christ, from which *his Relation* of *Righteous* did result.

3. We must distinguish of *Imputation*, which signifyeth (here) 1. To repute us *personally* to have been the *Agents of Christs Acts*, the *subjects* of his *Habits and Passion* in a Physical sence. 2. Or to repute the same *formal Relation* of *Righteousness* which was in Christs person, to be in *ours* as the *subject*. 3. Or to repute us to have been the very *subjects of Christ's Habits and Passion*, and the Agents of his *Acts* in a *Political* or *Moral sense*, (and not a physical); as a man payeth a debt by his Servant, or Attorney, or Delegate. 4. And consequently to repute a *double formal Righteousness* to result from the said *Habits*, *Acts*, and *Passions*; one to *Christ* as the *natural Subject* and *Agent*, and *another to us* as the *Moral, Political*, or *reputed Subject* and *Agent* (And so his *Formal Righteousness* not to be imputed to us *in it self as ours*, but *another* to result from the same *Matter.*) 5. Or else that we are reputed both the *Agents* and *Subjects* of the *Matter* of his Righteousness, morally, and also of the *Formal Righteousness* of *Christ himself.* 6. Or else by Imputation is meant here, that Christ being truly reputed to have taken the Nature of sinful man, and become a Head for all true Believers, in that undertaken *Nature* and *Office* in the *Person* of a *Mediator*, to have fulfilled *all the Law imposed on him*, by perfect *Holiness*

and *Obedience*, and *Offering* himself on the Cross a *Sacrifice for our sins*, voluntarily suffering in our stead, as if he had been a sinner, (guilty of all our sins) As soon as we believe we are pardoned, justified, adopted for *the sake and merit* of this Holiness, Obedience and penal Satisfaction of Christ, with as full demonstration of divine *Justice*, at least, and more full demonstration of his *Wisdom* and *Mercy*, than if we had suffered our selves what our sins deserved (that is, been damned) or had never sinned: And so *Righteousness is imputed to us*, that is, *we are accounted or reputed righteous*, (not in relation to the Precept, that is, *innocent*, or *sinless*, but in relation to the *Retribution*, that is, *such as have Right to Impunity and Life*,) because Christ's foresaid perfect Holiness, Obedience and Satisfaction, *merited our Pardon, and Adoption, and the Spirit*; or merited the *New-Covenant*, by which, as an Instrument, *Pardon, Justification and Adoption* are given to Believers, and the *Spirit* to be given to sanctifie them: And when we believe, we are justly *reputed* such as have *Right* to all these purchased Gifts.

4. And that it may be understood how far Christ did *Obey* or *Suffer* in our *stead*, or *person*, we must distinguish, 1. Between his taking the *Nature* of *sinful* man, and taking the Person of sinners. 2. Between his taking the *Person* of a *sinner*, and taking the *Person* of *you* and *me*, and each particular sinner. 3. Between his taking our sinful persons *simply*, *& ad omnia*, and taking them only, *secundum quid*, *in tantum*, *& ad hoc*. 4. Between his *suffering* in the *Person* of sinners, and his *obeying* and *sanctity in the Person* of sinners, or of us in particular. 5. Between his *Obeying* and *Suffering* in *our Person*, and

and our *Obeying* and *Suffering* in his Person (*Natural or Political.*) And now I shall make use of these distinctions, by the Propositions following.

Prop. 1. The phrase of [*Christ's Righteousness imputed to us*] is not in the Scripture.

2. Therefore when it cometh to Disputation, to them that deny it, some Scripture-phrase should be put in stead of it; because, 1. The Scripture hath as good, if not much better, phrases, to signifie all in this that is necessary. 2. And it is supposed that the Disputants are agreed of all that is express in the Scripture.

3. Yet so much is said in Scripture, as may make this phrase [*of Imputing Christ's Righteousness to us*] justifiable, in the sound sence here explained: For the thing meant by it is true, and the phrase intelligible.

4. Christ's Righteousness is imputed to Believers, in the sixth sence here before explained; As the Meritorious cause of our Pardon, Justification, Righteousness, Adoption, Sanctification and Salvation, &c. as is opened.

5. Christ did not suffer all in kind (much less in duration) which sinful man deserved to suffer: As *e. g.* 1. He was not hated of God; 2. Nor deprived or deserted of the sanctifying Spirit, and so of its Graces and Gods Image; Nor had 3. any of that permitted penalty by which sin it self is a misery and punishment to the sinner. 4. He fell not under the Power of the Devil as a deceiver and ruler, as the ungodly do. 5. His Conscience did not accuse him of sin, and torment him for it. 6. He did not totally despair of ever being saved. 7. The

fire of Hell did not torment his body. More such instances may be given for proof.

6. Christ did not perform all the same obedience in kind, which many men, yea all men, are or were bound to perform. As 1. He did not dress and keep that Garden which *Adam* was commanded to dress and keep. 2. He did not the conjugal offices which *Adam*, and millions more, were bound to. 3. Nor the Paternal Offices to Children. 4. Nor all the offices of a King on Earth, or Magistrate: nor of a Servant, &c. Nor the duty of the Sick. 5. He did not repent of sin, nor turn from it to God, nor mortifie or resist in himself any sinful lust; nor receive a Saviour by Faith, nor was circumcised or baptized for the Remission of his sins; nor loved God or thanked him for redeeming or pardoning him; nor obeyed God in the use of any Ordinance or Means, for the subduing of sin, and healing or saving of his Soul from any sin or deserved wrath of God; with much more such.

7. Christ did perform much which no man else was bound to do: As to redeem Souls, to work his Miracles and the rest of the works, peculiar to the Mediator.

8. That Law which bound us to Suffering, (or made it our due) bound not Christ to it, (as being innocent); But he was bound to it by the Fathers Law of Mediator, and by his own voluntary sponsion.

9. The Law obliging every sinner himself to suffer, was not *fulfilled* by the *Suffering* of Christ our Sponsor: But only the *Lawgiver satisfied* by attaining its Ends. For neither the letter nor sence of it said, [*If thou sin, thou or thy surety shall suffer.*]

10. Christ

10. Christ *satisfied Justice* and *obeyed* in *Humane Nature*, which also was *Holy* in him.

11. He did not this as a *Natural* Root, or Head to man, as *Adam* was; to convey *Holiness* or *Righteousness* by *natural propagation*, as *Adam* should have done; and did by sin: For Christ had no Wife or natural Children; But as a *Head, by Contract* as a Husband to a Wife, and a King to a Kingdom, and a *Head of Spiritual Influx.*

12. No as being *Actually* such a Head to the Redeemed when he *Obeyed* and *Suffered*; but as a Head by *Aptitude* and *Office*, *Power* and *Virtue*, who was to *become a Head actually* to every one when they *Believed* and *Consented*; Being before a *Head for them*, and *over those that did exist*, but not a *Head to them*, in act.

13. Therefore they were not Christs members Political, (much less Natural) when he obeyed and died.

14. A Natural Head being but a *part of a person*, what it doth the *Person doth.* But seeing a *Contracted Head*, and all the *members* of his *Body Contracted* or *Politick*, are every one a *distinct Person*, it followeth not that each person did really or reputatively what the *Head did.* Nay it is a good consequence that [*If he did it as Head, they did it not* (numerically) as *Head* or *Members.*]

15. Christ *Suffered* and *Obeyed* in the Person of the Mediator between God and man; and as a *subject* to the Law of Mediation.

16. Christ may be said to suffer *in the person of a sinner*, as it meaneth *his own person reputed and used as* a *sinner* by his persecutors, and as he was one who stood before God as an Undertaker to suffer for Man's sin.

17. Christ

17. Christ suffered in the *place* and *stead* of *sinners*, that they might be delivered, though in the *person* of a *Sponsor*.

18. When we are agreed that the *Person* of the *Sponsor*, and of every *particular sinner* are divers; and that Christ had not suffered, if we had not sinned, and that he as a *Sponsor suffered in our stead*, and so bore the punishment, which *not he, but we deserved*; If any will here instead of a *Mediator* or *Sponsor* call him our *Representative*, and say that he suffered *even in all our Persons reputatively*, not *simpliciter*, but *secundum quid*, & *in tantum* only; that is, not representing our *Persons simply* and in all *respects*, and to *all ends*, but *only so far* as to be a *sacrifice* for *our sins*, and suffer in our *place* and *stead* what he suffered; we take this to be but *lis de nomine*, a question about the *name* and *words*: And we will not oppose any man that thinketh those words fittest, as long as we agree in the matter signified. And so many Protestant Divines say that Christ suffered in the person of every sinner, (at least Elect,) that is, so far only and to such effects.

19. Christ did not suffer strictly, simply, absolutely, in the *person* of any one elect sinner, much less in the millions of persons of them all, in Lawsence, or in Gods esteem. God did not esteem Christ to be *naturally*, or as an *absolute Representer*, *David*, *Manasseh*, *Paul*, and every such other sinner, but only a Mediator that suffered in their stead.

20. God did make Christ *to be sin* for us; that is, A *Sacrifice for our sin*, and one that by *Man* was *reputed*, and by *God and Man* was *used*, as *sinners are*, and deserve to be.

21. Christ was not our *Delegate* in *Obeying* or *Suffering*;

Suffering: We did not commission him, or depute him to do what he did in our stead: But he did it by God's Appointment and his own Will.

22. Therefore he did it on God's terms, and to what effects it pleased God, and not on our terms, nor to what effects we please.

23. God did not suppose or repute Christ, to have committed all or any of the sins which we all committed, nor to have had all the wickedness in his nature which was in ours, nor to have deserved what we deserved: Nor did he in this proper sence *impute our sins* to Christ.

24. The false notion of God's strict imputing all our sins to Christ, and esteeming him the greatest sinner in the World, being so great a Blasphemy both against the Father and the Son, it is, safest in such Controversies to hold to the plain and ordinary words of Scripture. And it is not the *Wisdom* nor *Impartiality* of some men, who greatly cry up the Scripture-perfection, and decry the addition of a Ceremony or Form in the Worship of God; that yet think Religion is endangered, if our Confession use not the phrases of [*God's Imputing our sin to Christ, and his Imputing Christ's Righteousness to us*] when neither of them is in the Scripture; As if all God's Word were not *big* or *perfect* enough to make us a Creed or Confession in such phrases as it is fit for Christians to take up with: Countenancing the Papists, whose Faith is swelled to the many Volumes of the Councils, and no man can know how much more is to be added, and when we have all.

25. God doth not repute or account us to have *suffered* in our Natural persons what Christ suffered for us, nor Christ to have suffered in our Natural persons.

26. Though

26. Though Christ *suffered in our stead*, and in a large sence, to certain uses and in *some respects*, as the *Representer*, or in the *Persons* of sinners; yet did he not so far *represent* their persons in his *Habitual Holiness and Actual Obedience* (no not in the *Obedience* of his *Suffering*,) as he did in the *suffering it self*. He obeyed not in the *Person* of a *sinner*, much less of millions of sinners; which were to say, *In the person of sinners he never sinned*. He suffered, to save us from suffering; but he *obeyed not to save us from obeying*, but to bring us to Obedience. Yet his *Perfection* of *Obedience* had this *end*, that *perfect Obedience* might not be *necessary* in us to our Justification and Salvation.

27. It was not *we our selves* who did *perfectly obey*, or were *perfectly holy*, or suffered for sin in the *Person* of *Christ*, or by *Him*: Nor did we (*Naturally* or *Morally*) *merit* our own Salvation by obeying in Christ; nor did *we satisfie Gods Justice for our sins*, nor purchase pardon of Salvation to our selves, by our *Suffering* in and *by Christ*; All such phrase and sence is contrary to Scripture. But Christ did this for us.

28. Therefore God doth not repute us to have done it, seeing it is not true.

29. It is impossible for the *individual* formal *Righteousness* of Christ, to be our *Formal personal Righteousness*. Because it is a *Relation* and *Accident*, which cannot be translated from subject to subject, and cannot be in divers subjects the same.

30. Where the question is, Whether Christs *Material Righteousness*, that is, his *Habits*, *Acts* and *Sufferings* themselves, be *Ours*, we must consider how a man can have *Propriety in Habits*, *Acts and Passions*.

Passions who is the *subject* of them: and in *Actions*, who is the *Agent* of them. To *Give the same Individual Habit or Passion* to another, *is an Impossibility*; that is, to make him by Gift the subject of it. For it is not the same, if it be in another subject. To *make* one *man really* or *physically* to have been the *Agent* of *anothers Act*, even that *Individual Act*, if he was not so, is a contradiction and impossibility; that is, to make it true, that I did that which I did not. To be ours by *Divine Imputation*, cannot be, *to be ours by a false Reputation*, or supposition that we did what we did not: For God cannot err or lie. There is therefore but one of these two ways left, *Either that we our selves in person, truly had the habits which Christ had, and did all that Christ did, and suffered all that he suffered, and so satisfied and merited Life in and by him, as by an Instrument, or Legal Representer of our persons in all this*; Which I am anon to Confute: or else, That *Christs Satisfaction*, Righteousness, and the *Habits*, *Acts* and *Sufferings* in which it lay, are imputed to us, and made ours; not rigidly in the very thing it self, but in the *Effects* and *Benefits*; In as much as we are as really *Pardoned*, *Justified*, *Adopted* by them, as the Meritorious cause, by the instrumentality of the Covenants Donation, as if we our selves had done and suffered all that Christ did, as a Mediator and Sponsor, do and suffer for us: I say, As *really* and *certainly*, and with a fuller demonstration of Gods Mercy and Wisdom, and with a sufficient demonstration of his Justice. But not that our propriety in the benefits is in all respects the same, as it should have been if we had *been*, *done*, *and suffered our selves* what Christ did. Thus Christs Righteousness is ours.

31. Christ

31. Christ is truly *The Lord our Righteousness*; in more respects than one or two: 1. In that he is the *meritorious Cause* of the *Pardon of all our sins*, and our full Justification, Adoption, and right to Glory: and by his Satisfaction and Merits only, our Justification by the Covenant of Grace against the Curse of the Law of Works is purchased. 2. In that he is the Legislator, Testator and Donor of our Pardon, and Justification: by this new-Testament or Covenant. 3. In that he is the Head of Influx, and King and Intercessor, by and from whom the *Spirit* is given, to sanctifie us to God, and cause us sincerely to perform the Conditions of the Justifying and saving Covenant, in Accepting and Improving the mercy then given. 4. In that he is the Righteous Judge and Justifyer of Believers by sentence of Judgment. In all these Respects he is *The Lord our Righteousness*.

32. We are said *to be made the Righteousness of God in him*: 1. In that, as he was *used like* a *sinner* for us, (but not esteemed one by God) so we are used *like Innocent persons* so far as to be *saved* by him. 2. In that through his *Merits*, and upon our *union with him*, when we believe and consent to his Covenant, we are *pardoned* and *justified*, and so made *Righteous* really, that is, such as are not to be *condemned* but to be glorified. 3. In that the *Divine Nature* and *Inherent Righteousness*, to them that are *in him by Faith*, are for his Merits, given by the Holy Ghost. 4. In that God's Justice and Holiness Truth, Wisdom, and Mercy, are all wonderfully demonstrated in this way of pardoning and justifying sinners by Christ. Thus are we made the Righteousness of God in him.

33. For

33. For *Righteousness to be imputed to us*, is all one as to be accounted *Righteous*, Rom. 4. 6, 11. notwithstanding that we be not Righteous as fulfillers of the Law of Innocency.

34. For *Faith to be imputed to us for Righteousness*, Rom. 4. 22, 23, 24. is plainly meant, that God who under the Law of Innocency required perfect Obedience, of us to our Justification and Glorification, upon the *satisfaction* and *merits* of Christ, ~~hath~~ freely given a full *Pardon* and *Right* to *Life*, to all true Believers; so that now by the Covenant of Grace nothing is required *of us*, to our Justification, but *Faith*: all the rest being done by Christ: And so Faith in God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, is reputed truly to be the condition on our part, on which Christ and Life, by that Baptismal Covenant, are made ours.

35. Justification, Adoption, and Life eternal are considered; 1. *Quoad ipsam rem*, as to the thing it self in value. 2. *Quoad, Ordinem Conferendi & Recipiendi*, as to the *order* and *manner* of *Conveyance* and *Participation*. In the first respect, *It is a meer free-gift to us, purchased by Christ*: In the second respect, It is a *Reward* to Believers, who thankfully accept the free-Gift according to its nature and uses.

36. It is an error contrary to the scope of the Gospel to say, that *the Law of Works, or of Innocency*, doth justifie us, as performed either by our selves, or by Christ. For that Law condemneth and curseth us; And we are not efficiently justified by it, but *from or against it*.

37. Therefore we have no Righteousness in *Reality* or *Reputation formally ours*, which consisteth in

in the first *species*; that is, in a *Conformity to the Preceptive part of the Law of Innocency*; we are not *reputed Innocent*: But only a Righteousness which consisteth in *Pardon of all sin, and right to life*, (with *sincere performance of the Condition of the Covenant of Grace*, that is, *True Faith*.)

38. Our pardon puts not away our *Guilt of Fact* or *Fault*, but our *Guilt of, or, obligation to Punishment*. God doth not repute us such as never sinned, or such as by our Innocency merited Heaven, but such as are not to be *damned*, but to be *glorified*, because *pardoned* and *adopted* through the Satisfaction and Merits of Christ.

39. Yet the *Reatus Culpæ* is remitted to us Relatively as to the punishment, though not in it self; that is, It shall not procure our Damnation: Even as Christ's Righteousness is, though not in it self, yet respectively as to the Benefits said to be *made ours*, in as much as we shall have those benefits by it.

40. Thus both the *Material* and the *Formal Righteousness* of *Christ are made ours*; that is, *Both* the *Holy Habits* and *Acts*, and his *Sufferings*, *with the Relative formal Righteousness of his own Person*, because these are altogether one Meritorious cause of our Justification, commonly called the Material Cause.

Obj. *But though Forma Denominat; yet if Christs Righteousness in Matter and Form, be the Meritorious Cause of ours, and that be the same with the Material Cause*, it is a *very tolerable speech to say, that His Righteousness is Ours in it self, while it is the very matter of ours.*

Ans. 1. When any man is *Righteous Immediately by*

any

any action, that action is called *the Matter* of his *Righteousneſs*, in ſuch an Analogical ſenſe as Action, an *Accident* may be called *Matter*, becauſe the *Relation* of Righteous is founded or ſubjected firſt or partly in that *Action*. And ſo when Chriſt perfectly *obeyed*, it was the *Matter of his Righteouſneſs*. But to be Righteous and to *Merit* are not all one notion: Merit is adventitious to meer Righteouſneſs. Now it is not Chriſts *Actions* in themſelves that our Righteouſneſs reſulteth from immediately as his own did; But there is firſt his *Action*, then his *formal Righteouſneſs thereby*; and *thirdly*, *his Merit* by that *Righteouſneſs* which goes to procure the *Covenant-Donation* of Righteouſneſs to us, by which Covenant we are *efficiently* made Righteous. So that the name of a *Material Cauſe* is much more properly given to *Chriſts Actions*, as to his *own formal Righteouſneſs*, than as to *ours*. But yet this is but *de nomine*.

2. Above all, conſider what that *Righteouſneſs* is which Chriſt merited for us, (which is the heart of the Controverſie.) It is not of the ſame *ſpecies* or ſort with his own. His Righteouſneſs was a perfect *ſinleſs Innocency*, and *Conformity* to the *preceptive part of the Law of Innocency in Holineſs*. Ours is not ſuch. The diſſenters think it is ſuch by *Imputation*, and here is the difference. Ours is but in reſpect to the *ſecond* or *retributive part* of the *Law*; a *Right to Impunity and Life*, *and a Juſtification* not at all *by that Law*, *but from its curſe or condemnation*. The Law that ſaith, *Obey perfectly and live*, *ſin and die*, doth not juſtifie us as perſons that have perfectly obeyed it, really or imputatively; But its *obligation to puniſhment is diſſolved*, not by it ſelf, but by the Law *of Grace*. It is then by the Law

of

of Grace that we are judged and justified. According to it, 1. We are not *really* or *reputatively such* as have *perfectly fulfilled* all *its Precepts:* 2. But we are such as by Grace do *sincerely perform* the *Condition* of its promise. 3. By which promise of Gift, we are such as have right to Christs own *person*, in the Relation and Union of a Head and Saviour, and with him the pardon of all our sins, and the *right of Adoption, to the Spirit, and the Heavenly Inheritance as purchased by Christ.* So that besides our Inherent or Adherent Righteousness of sincere *Faith, Repentance and Obedience*, as the performed condition of the Law of Grace, we have no other Righteousness our selves, but *Right to Impunity and to Life*: and not any *imputed sinless Innocency* at all. God *pardoneth* our sins and *adopteth* us, for the sake of Christs sufferings and *perfect Holiness*: But he doth not account us *perfectly Holy* for it, nor *perfectly Obedient.* So that how-ever you will call it, *whether* a *Material Cause* or a *Meritorious*, the thing is plain.

Obj. *He is made of God Righteousness to us.*

Ans. True: But that's none of the question. But how is he so made? 1. As he is made Wisdom, Sanctification and Redemption as aforesaid. 2. By Merit, Satisfaction, Direction, Prescription and Donation. He is the Meritorious Cause of our Pardon, of our Adoption, of our Right to Heaven, of that new Covenant which is the Instrumental Deed of Gift, confirming all these: And he is also our Righteousness in the sense that *Austin* so much standeth on, as all our Holiness and Righteousness of Heart and Life, is not of our natural endeavour, but his gift, and operation by his Spirit; causingus

to

to obey his Holy precepts and Example. All these ways he is made of God our Righteousness: Besides the Objective way of sense; as he is *Objectively* made our *Wisdom*, because it is the truest wisdom to know him; So he is objectively made our *Righteousness*, in that it is that Gospel-Righteousness which is required *of our selves*, by his grace, to believe in him and obey him.

41. Though Christ fulfilled not the Law by Habitual Holiness and Actual Obedience, strictly in the Individual person of each particular sinner; yet he did it in the nature of Man: And so humane nature, (considered *in specie*, and in Christ personally, though not considered as *a totum*, or as personally in each man,) did satisfie and fullfil the Law and Merit. As Humane Nature sinned in *Adam* actually in *specie*, and in his individual person, and all our *Persons* were *seminally* and *virtually* in him, and accordingly sinned, or are reputed sinners, as having no nature but what he conveyed who could convey no better than he had (either as to Relation or Real quality): But not that God reputed us to have been *actually existent*, as *really distinct persons* in *Adam* (which is not true.) Even so Christ obeyed and suffered in our *Nature*, and in our nature as it was in him; and humane sinful nature in *specie* was Universally pardoned by him, and *Eternal life freely given to all men* for his merits, thus far imputed to them, their sins being not imputed to hinder this Gift; which is made in and by the Covenant of Grace: Only the Gift hath the Condition of mans Acceptance of it according to its nature, 2 *Cor.* 5. 19, 20. And all the individuals that shall in time by Faith accept the Gift, are there and thereby made

such as the Covenant for his merits doth justifie, by that General Gift.

42. As *Adam* was a Head by *Nature*, and therefore conveyed Guilt by natural Generation; so Christ is a Head (not by nature but) by Sacred Contract; and therefore conveyeth Right to Pardon, Adoption and Salvation, not by Generation, but by Contract, or Donation. So that what it was to be *naturally* in *Adam*, seminally and virtually, though not personlly in existence; even that it is, in order to our benefit by him to be *in Christ by Contract or the new Covenant*, virtually, though not in personal existence when the Covenant was made.

43. They therefore that look upon Justification or Righteousness, as coming to us immediately by Imputation of Christs Righteousness to us, without the Instrumental Intervention and Conveyance or Collation by this Deed of Gift or Covenant, do confound themselves by confounding and overlooking the Causes of our Justification. That which Christ did by his merits was to procure the new Covenant. The new Covenant is a free Gift of pardon and life with Christ himself, for his merits and satisfaction sake.

44. Though the Person of the Mediator be not really or reputatively the very *person of each sinner*, (nor so *many persons* as there are *sinners* or *believers*,) yet it doth belong to the *Person of the Mediator*, so far (limitedly) to *bear the person of a sinner*, and to stand in the place of the *Persons of all Sinners*, as to bear the punishment they deserved, and to suffer for their sins, *Conditionally*.

45. Scripture speaking of moral matters, usually speaketh rather in Moral than meer Physical phrase:

phraſe: And in ſtrict Phyſical ſence, Chriſts very perſonal Righteouſneſs (Material or Formal) is not ſo given to us, as that we are proprietors of the very thing it ſelf, but only of the effects (Pardon, Righteouſneſs and Life,) yet in a larger Moral phraſe that very thing is oft ſaid to be given to us, which is given to another, or done or ſuffered for our benefit. He that ranſometh a Captive from a Conquerer, Phyſically giveth the Money to the Conquerer & not to the Captive, & giveth the Captive only the Liberty purchaſed: But *morally* and reputatively he is ſaid to give the Money to the Captive, becauſe he gave it *for him*. And it redeemeth him as well as if he had given it himſelf. He that giveth ten thouſand pounds to purchaſe Lands, & freely giveth that land to another; phyſically giveth the *Money* to the *Seller* only, and the Land only to the other. But morally and reputatively we content our ſelves with the metonymical phraſe, and ſay, he gave the other ten thouſand pound. So morally it may be ſaid, that Chriſts Righteouſneſs, Merits and Satisfaction, was given to us, in that the thing purchaſed by it was given to us; when the Satisfaction was given or made to God. Yea when we ſaid it was made to God, we mean only that he was paſſively the *Terminus* of active Satisfaction, being the party ſatisfyed; but not that he himſelf was made the Subject and Agent of Habits and Acts, and Righteouſneſs of Chriſt as in his humane nature, except as the Divine Nature acted it, or by Communication of Attributes.

46. Becauſe the words [*Perſon*] and [*Perſonating*] and [*Repreſenting*] are ambiguous (as all humane language is,) while ſome uſe them in a *ſtricter*

ſenſe than others do, we muſt try by other explicatory terms whether we agree in the matter, and not lay the ſtreſs of our Controverſy upon the bare words. So ſome Divines ſay that Chriſt ſuffered in the *Perſon of a ſinner*, when they mean not that he repreſented the Natural perſon of any one particular ſinner; but that his own *Perſon* was reputed the Sponſor of ſinners by God, and that he was judged a real ſinner by his perſecuters; and ſo ſuffered as if he had been a ſinner.

47. As Chriſt is leſs improperly ſaid to have Repreſented our Perſons in his ſatisfactory Sufferings, than in his perſonal perfect *Holineſs* and *Obedience*; ſo he is leſs improperly ſaid to have *Repreſented all mankind as newly fallen in Adam, in a General ſenſe, for the purchaſing of the univerſal Gift of Pardon and Life, called, The new Covenant*; *than to have Repreſented in his perfect Holineſs and his Sufferings, every Believer conſidered as from his firſt being to his Death.* Though it is certain that he dyed for all their ſins from firſt to laſt. For it is moſt true, 1. That Chriſt is as a ſecond *Adam*, the Root of the Redeemed; And as we derive ſin from *Adam*, ſo we derive life from Chriſt, (allowing the difference between a Natural and a Voluntary way of derivation.) And though no mans *Perſon* as a *Perſon* was actually *exiſtent* and *offended* in *Adam*, (nor was by God reputed to have been and done) yet all mens Perſons were *Virtually* and *Seminally* in *Adam* as is aforeſaid; and when they *are exiſtent perſons*, they are no better either by *Relative Innocency*, or by *Phyſical Diſpoſition*, than he could propagate: and are truly and juſtly reputed by God to be *Perſons Guilty of Adams fact*, ſo far as they were by nature ſemi-

seminally and virtually in him: And Christ the second *Adam* is in a sort the root of *Man as Man*, (though not by propagation of us, yet) as he is the *Redeemer* of *Nature* it self from destruction, but more notably the *Root* of *Saints as Saints*, who are to have no real sanctity but what shall be derived from him by Regeneration, as Nature and Sin is from *Adam* by Generation. But *Adam* did not represent all his posterity as to all the Actions which they should do themselves from their Birth to their Death; so that they should all have been taken for perfectly obedient to the death, if *Adam* had not sinned at that time, yea or during his Life. For if any of them under that Covenant had ever sinned afterward in their own person, they should have died for it. But for the time past, they were Guiltless or Guilty in *Adam*, as he was Guiltless or Guilty himself, so far as they were in *Adam*: And though that was but in *Causâ, & non extra causam*; Yet a Generating Cause which propagateth essence from essence, by self-multiplication of form, much differeth from an *Arbitrary facient Cause* in this. If *Adam* had obeyed, yet all his posterity had been nevertheless bound to perfect personal persevering Obedience on pain of Death. And Christ the second *Adam* so far bore the person of fallen *Adam*, and suffered in the nature and room of Mankind in General, as without any condition on their part at all; to give man by an act of Oblivion or new Covenant a pardon of *Adams* sin, yea and of all sin past, at the time of their consent, though not disobliging them from all future Obedience. And by his perfect Holiness and Obedience and Sufferings, he hath merited that new Covenant, which *Accepteth* of

sincere, though imperfect, Obedience, and maketh no more in us necessary to Salvation. When I say he did this *without* any *Condition* on mans part, I mean, He *absolutely without Condition, merited and gave us the Justifying Testament* or *Covenant*. Though that Covenant give us not Justification absolutely, but on Condition of *believing, fiducial Consent*. 2. And so as this *Universal Gift* of Justification upon Acceptance, is actually given to all fallen mankind as such; so Christ might be said to suffer instead of all, yea and merit too, so far as to procure them this Covenant-gift.

48. The sum of all lyeth in applying the distinction of giving Christs Righteousness *as such in it self*, and as *a cause of our Righteousness*, or in the *Causality of it*. As our sin is not reputed Christs sin *in it self*, and in the culpability of it (for then it must needs make Christ odious to God) but in its *Causality of punishment*: so Christ's Material or Formal Righteousness, is not by God reputed to be properly and absolutely *our own* in *it self* as *such*, but the *Causality* of it as it produceth such and such effects.

49. The Objections which are made against Imputation of Christs Righteousness in the sound sense, may all be answered as they are by our Divines; among whom the chiefest on this subject are *Davenant de Justit. Habit & Actual. Johan. Crocius de Justif. Nigrinus de Impletione Legis*, Bp. *G. Downman of Justif. Chamier, Paræus, Amesius and Junius* against *Bellarm*. But the same reasons against the unsound sence of Imputation are unanswerable. Therefore if any shall say concerning my following Arguments, that most of them are used, by *Gregor. de*

de Valent. by *Bellarm. Becanus*, or other Papists, or by Socinians, and are answered by *Nigrinus*, *Crocius*, *Davenant*, &c. Such words may serve to deceive the simple that are led by Names and Prejudice; but to the Intelligent they are contemptible, unless they prove that these objections are made by the Papists against the same sence of Imputation against which I use them, and that it is that sense which all those Protestants defend in answering them: For who-ever so answereth them, will appear to answer them in vain.

50. How far those Divines who do use the phrase of *Christs suffering in our person*, do yet limit the sense in their exposition, and deny that we are reputed to have fulfilled the Law in Christ: because it is tedious to cite many, I shall take up now with one, even Mr. *Lawson* in his *Theopolitica*, which (though about the office of Faith he some-what differ from me) I must needs call an excellent Treatise, as I take the Author to be one of the most Knowing men yet living that I know.) Pardon me if I be large in transcribing his words.

"Pag. 100, 101. [If we enquire of the manner "how Righteousness and Life is derived from Christ, "being one unto so many, it cannot be, except "Christ be a general Head of mankind, and one "Person with them, as *Adam* was. We do not read of "any but two whowere general Heads, and in some "respect virtually, *All mankind*; the "*first* and *second Adam*. —— The Mark, *Virtually*. "principal cause of this Representation "whereby he is one person with us, is "the will of God, who as Lord made him such, "and as Lawgiver and Judge did so account him.

" But, 2. How far is he *One person with us?* Anſ.
" 1. In general ſo far as it pleaſed God
Not abſolutely. " to make him ſo, and no further. 2. In
" particular, He and we are one ſo far
" 1. As to make him liable to the pe-
" nalty of the Law for us. 2. So far as to free us
" from that obligation, and derive the benefit of his
" death to us. Though Chriſt be ſo far one with us
" as to be lyable unto the penalty of the Law, and
" to ſuffer it, and upon this ſuffering we are freed;
" yet Chriſt is not the ſinner, nor the ſinner Chriſt.
" Chriſt is the Word made fleſh, innocent without
" ſin, an univerſal Prieſt and King: but we are none
" of theſe. Though we be accounted
Mark by a Trope. " as one perſon in Law with him, by a
" Trope; yet in proper ſence it cannot
" be ſaid *that in Chriſt's Satisfying we*
" *ſatisfied for our own ſins.* For then we ſhould have
" been the Word made fleſh, able to plead Innocen-
" cy, *&c.* All which are falſe, impoſ-
Mark how far. " ſible, blaſphemous if affirmed by any.
" It's true, we are ſo one with him, that
" he ſatisfied for us, and the benefit of
" this Satisfaction redounds to us, and is communi-
" cable to all, upon certain termes; though not
" actually communicated to all: From this Unity
" and Identity of perſon in Law (if I may ſo
" ſpeak) it followeth clearly that Chriſt's ſuffer-
" ings were not only Afflictions, but Puniſhments
" in proper ſenſe. —*Pag.* 102, 103. That Chriſt
" died for all in ſome ſence muſt needs be granted,
" becauſe the Scripture expreſly affirms it (*vid.*
" *reliqua.*) —

" There is another queſtion unprofitably hand-
" led,

led, Whether the *Propitiation* which includeth both Satisfaction and Merit, be to be aſcribed to the Active or Paſſive Obedience of Chriſt? *Anſ.* 1. "Both his Active, Perſonal, Perfect and Perpetual "Obedience, which by reaſon of his humane nature "aſſumed, and ſubjection unto God was due, and al- "ſo that Obedience to the great and tranſcendent "Command of ſuffering the death of the Croſs, "both concur as Cauſes of Remiſſion and Juſtificati- "on. 2. The Scriptures uſually aſcribe it to the Blood, "Death, & Sacrifice of Chriſt, and never to the Perſo- "nal Active Obedience of Chriſt's to the Moral Law. "3. Yet this Active Obedience is neceſſary, becauſe "without it he could not have offered that great "Sacrifice of himſelf without ſpot to God. And if "it had not been without ſpot, it could not have "been propitiatory and effectual for Expiation. 4. If "Chriſt as our Surety had performed for us perfect "and perpetual Obedience, ſo that we might have "been judged to have perfectly and fully kept "the Law by him, then no ſin could have been "chargeable upon us, and the Death of Chriſt had "been needleſs and ſuperfluous. 5. Chriſts Propi- "tiation freeth the Believer not only from the obli- "gation unto puniſhment of ſenſe, but of loſs; "and procured for him not only deliverance from "evil deſerved, but the enjoyment of all good ne- "ceſſary to our full happineſs. Therefore, there is "no ground of Scripture for that opinion, that the "Death of Chriſt and his Sufferings free us from pu- "niſhments, and by his Active Obedience imputed "to us we are made righteous, and the heirs of life. "6. If Chriſt was bound to perform perfect and "perpetual Obedience for us, and he alſo performed

"it

" it for us, then we are freed not only from sin, but " Obedience too: And this Obedience as distinct and " separate from Obedience unto death, may be plea- " ded for Justification of Life, and will be sufficient " to carry the Cause. For the tenor of the Law " was this, *Do this and live:* And if man do this " by himself or Surety, so as that the Lawgiver and " supreme Judg accept it, the Law can require no " more. It could not bind to perfect Obedience and " to punishment too. There was never any such " Law made by God or just men. Before I conclude " this particular of the extent of Christs Merit and " Propitiation, I thought good to inform the Rea- " der, that as the Propitiation of Christ maketh no " man absolutely, but upon certain terms pardon- " able and savable; so it was never made, either " to prevent all sin, or all punishments: For it pre- " supposeth man both sinful and miserable: And " we know that the Guilt and Punishment of " *Adams* sin, lyeth heavy on all his posterity to this " day. And not only that, but the guilt of actual " and personal sins lyeth wholly upon us, whilest " impenitent and unbelieving and so out of Christ. " And the Regenerate themselves are not fully freed " from all punishments till the final Resurrection " and Judgment. So that his Propitiation doth not " altogether prevent but remove sin and punish- " ment by degrees. Many sins may be said to be " Remissible by vertue of this Sacrifice, which ne- " ver shall be remitted.] So far Mr. *Lawson*.

Here I would add only these Animadversions. 1. That whereas he explaineth *Christs personating us* in suffering by the similitude of a Debtor and his Surety who are the same person in Law: I note 1. That

That the case of Debt much differeth from the case of Punishment. 2. That a Surety of Debt is either antecedently such, or consequently: Antecedently, either first one that is bound equally with the Debtor; 2. or one that promiseth to pay if he do not. I think the Law accounteth neither of these to be the *Person* of the principal Debtor (as it doth a Servant by whom he sends the Debt.) But Christ was neither of these: For the Law did not beforehand oblige him with us, nor did he in Law-sence undertake to pay the Debt, if we failed. Though God decreed that he should do so; yet that was no part of the sence of the Law. But consequently, if a friend of the Debtor when he is in Jayl will, without his request or knowledg, say to the Creditor, I will pay you all the Debt; but so that he shall be in my power, and not have present liberty (lest he abuse it) but on the terms that I shall please; yea not at all if he ungratefully reject it] This *Consequent* Satisfyer, or Sponsor, or Paymaster, is not in Law-sence the same *Person* with the Debtor: But if any will call him so, I will not contend about a word, while we agree of the thing (the terms of deliverance.) And this is as near the Case between Christ and us, as the similitude of a Debtor will allow.

2. I do differ from Mr. *Lawson* and *Paræus*, and *Ursine*, and *Olevian*, and *Scultetus* and all that sort of worthy Divines in this; that whereas they make Christs Holiness and perfect Obedience to be but *Justitia personæ*, necessary to make his Sacrifice spotless and so effectual: I think that *of it self* it is as directly the cause of our Pardon, Justification and Life, as Christs Passion is; The Passion being satisfactory

factory and so meritorious, and the personal Holiness Meritorious and so Satisfactory. For the truth is, The Law that condemned us was not fulfilled by Christs suffering for us, but the *Lawgiver* satisfied instead of the fulfilling of it: And that Satisfaction lyeth, in the substitution of that which as fully (or more) attaineth the ends of the Law as our own suffering would have done. Now the ends of the Law may be attained by immediate Merit of Perfection as well as by Suffering; but best by both. For 1. By the perfect Holiness and Obedience of Christ, the Holy and perfect will of God is *pleased*: whence [*This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.*] 2. In order to the ends of Government, Holiness and perfect Obedience, is honoured and freed from the contempt which sin would cast upon it; and the holiness *of the Law* in its *Precepts* is publickly honoured in this grand Exemplar; In whom only the will of God was done on Earth, as it is done in Heaven. And such a Specimen to the World is greatly conducible to the ends of Government: So that Christ voluntarily taking humane nature, which as such is obliged to this Perfection, He first highly merited of God the Father hereby, and this with his Suffering, went to attain the ends that our suffering should have attained, much better. So that at least as *Meritorious*, if not secondarily as *satisfactory*, I see not but *Christs Holiness* procureth the *Justifying Covenant* for us, equally with his Death. A Prince may pardon a Traitor for *some noble service of his Friend*, as well as for his suffering: much more for both. This way go *Grotius de satisf.* Mr. *Bradshaw* and others.

3. When Mr *Lawson* saith that the Law binds not

not to Obedience and Punishment both, he meaneth as to the same Act: which contradicts not what *Nigrinus* and others say, that it binds a sinner to punishment for sin past, and yet to Obedience for the time to come: (which cannot be entire and perfect.)

So pag. 311. *Cap.* 22. *Qu.* 2. Whether there be two parts of Justification, Remission and Imputation of Christs Righteousness. 1. He referreth us to what is aforecited against Imputation of Christs Active Righteousness, separated or abstracted for Reward from the Passive. 2. He sheweth that *Paul* taketh *Remission of sin and Imputation of Righteousness for the same thing.*] So say many of ours.

In conclusion I will mind the Reader, that by reading some Authors for Imputation, I am brought to doubt whether some deny not all true Remission of sin, that is, Remission of the deserved punishment. Because I find that by *Remission* they mean *A non-Imputation of sin under the formal notion of sin*; that God taketh it not to be our sin, but Christs; and Christs Righteousness and perfection to be so ours, as that God accounteth us not as truly sinners. And so they think that the *Reatus Culpæ* as well as *Pœnæ* simply in it self is done away. Which if it be so, then the *Reatus Pœnæ*, the obligation to punishment, or the *dueneſs* of punishment, cannot be said to be dissolved or remitted, because it was never contracted. Where I hold, that it is the *Reatus ad Pœnam*, the *Dueneſs* of punishment only that is remitted, and the *guilt* of *sin* not as in it self, but in its *Causality* of punishment. And so in all common language, we say we forgive a man his fault, when we forgive him all the penalty positive and privative. Not esteeming him, 1. Never to have done the fact. 2. Or that

fact

fact not to have been a fault, *and his fault*; 3. but that punishment for that fault, is forgiven him, and the fault so far as it is a cause of punishment. We must not feign God to judg falsly.

This maketh me think of a saying of Bp. *Ushers* to me, when I mentioned the Papists placing Justification and Remission of sin conjunct, he told me that the Papists ordinarily acknowledg no Remission. And on search I find that *Aquinas* and the most of them place no true Remission of sin, in Justification: For by *Remission* (which they make part of Justification,) they mean *Mortification, or destroying sin it self* in the act or habit. But that the *pardon* of the punishment is a thing that we all need, is not denyable; nor do they deny it, though they deny it to be part of our Justification. For it's strange if they deny Christ the pardoning power which they give the Pope. And as *Joh. Crocius de Justif.* oft tells them, They should for shame grant that Christs Righteousness may be as far imputed to us, as they say a Saints or Martyrs redundant merits and supererogations are.

But if the *Guilt* of *Fact and Guilt of Fault* in it self considered, be not both imputed first to us, that is, If we be not judged sinners, I cannot see how we can be judged *Pardoned sinners*; For he that is judged to have no sin, is judged to deserve no punishment. Unless they will say that to prevent the *form and desert* of *sin*, is *eminenter*, though not *formaliter*, to forgive. But it is another (even Actual) forgiveness which we hear of in the Gospel, and pray for daily in the Lords prayer. Of all which see the full Scripture-proof in Mr. *Hotchkis* of *Forgiveness of sin.*

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

A further explication of the Controversie.

Yet I am afraid lest I have not made the state of the Controversie plain enough to the unexercised Reader, and lest the very explicatory distinctions and propositions, though needful and suitable to the matter, should be unsuitable to his capacity; I will therefore go over it again in a shorter way, and make it as plain as possibly I can; being fully perswaded, that it is not so much Argumentation, as help to understand *the* matter, *and our* own *and* other mens ambiguous *words, that is needful to end our abominable Contentions.*

§ 1. THE Righteousness of a Person is formally a moral Relation of that Person.

§ 2. This moral Relation, is the Relation of that person to the *Rule* by which he is to be judged.

§ 3. And it is his Relation to some *Cause*, or supposed Accusation or Question to be decided by that judgment.

§ 4. The Rule of Righteousness here is Gods Law, naturally or supernaturally made known.

§ 5. The

§ 5. The Law hath a Preceptive part, determining what ſhall be due from us, and a Retributive part determining what ſhall be due to us.

§ 6. The Precept inſtituting Duty, our Actions and Diſpoſitions, which are the Matter of that duty, are phyſically conſidered, conform or diſconform to the Precept.

§ 7. Being Phyſically, they are conſequently ſo Morally conſidered, we being Moral Agents, and the Law a Rule of Morality.

§ 8. If the *Actions* be righteous or unrighteous, conſequently the Perſon is ſo, in reference to thoſe Actions, ſuppoſing that to be his *Cauſe*, or the *Queſtion* to be decided.

§ 9. Unrighteouſneſs as to this Cauſe, is *Guilt*, or *Reatus Culpæ*; and to be unrighteous is to be *Sons*, or Guilty of ſin.

§ 10. The *Retributive* part of the Law is, 1. Premiant, for Obedience; 2. Penal, for Diſobedience.

§ 11. To be Guilty or Unrighteous as to the reward, is, to have no right to the reward (that being ſuppoſed the Queſtion in judgment): And to be Righteous here, is to have *right* to the *reward*.

§ 12. To be *Guilty* as to the penalty, is to be *jure puniendus*, or *Reus pœnæ*, or *obligatus ad pœnam*. And to be righteous here, is to have *Right* to *impunity*, (*quoad pœnam damni & ſenſus.*)

§ 13. The firſt Law made *perſonal*, *perfect*, *perſevering Innocency* both mans duty, and the Condition of the Reward and Impunity, and any ſin the condition of puniſhment.

§ 14. Man broke this Law, and ſo loſt his Innocency, and ſo the Condition became naturally impoſſible to him, *de futuro*.

§ 15. There-

§ 15. Therefore that Law as a Covenant, that is, the Promissory part with its Condition, ceased; *cessante capacitate subditi*; and so did the preceptive part. 1. As it commanded absolute Innocency (of act and habit.) 2. And as it commanded the seeking of the Reward on the Condition and by the means of personal Innocency. The Condition thus passing into the nature of a sentence; And punishment remaining due for the sin.

§ 16. But the Law remained still an obliging Precept for future perfect Obedience, and made punishment due for all future sin: and these two parts of it, as the Law of lapsed Nature, remained in force, between the first sin, and the new-Covenant promise or Law of Grace.

§ 17. The eternal Word interposing, a Mediator is promised, and Mercy maketh a Law of Grace, and the Word becometh mans Redeemer by undertaking, and by present actual reprieve, pardon and initial deliverance: and the fallen world, the miserable sinners, with the Law and obligations which they were under, are now become the Redemers *jure Redemptionis*, as before they were the Creator's *jure Creationis*.

§ 18. The Redeemers Law then hath two parts; 1. The said Law of lapsed nature (binding to future perfect obedience or punishment) which he found man under (called vulgarly the Moral Law.) 2. And a pardoning Remedying Law of Grace.

§ 19. Because man had dishonoured God and his Law by sin, the Redeemer undertook to take mans nature without sin, and by perfect Holiness and Obedience, and by becoming a Sacrifice for sin, to bring that Honour to God and his Law which

we should have done, and to attain the Ends of Law and Government instead of our *Perfection* or *Punishment*, that for the Merit hereof we might be delivered and live.

§ 20. This he did in the third person of a Mediator, who as such had a Law or Covenant proper to himself, the Conditions of which he performed, (by perfect keeping, 1. The Law of Innocency; 2. Of *Moses*; 3. And that proper to himself alone) and so merited all that was promised to him, for Himself and Us.

§ 21. By his Law of Grace (as our Lord-Redeemer) he gave first to all mankind (in *Adam*, and after in *Noah*, and by a second fuller edition at his Incarnation) a free Pardon of the destructive punishment (but not of all punishment) with right to his Spirit of Grace, Adoption and Glory, in Union with Himself their Head, on Condition initially of Faith and Repentance, and progressively of sincere Obedience to the end, to be performed by his Help or Grace.

§ 22. By this Law of Grace (supposing the Law of lapsed nature aforesaid, inclusively) all the World is ruled, and shall be judged, according to that edition of it (to *Adam* or by Christ) which they are under. And by it they shall be Justified or Condemned.

§ 23. If the question then be, Have you kept or not kept the Conditions of the Law of Grace, Personal Performance or nothing must so far be our Righteousness, and not Christs keeping them for us, or Satisfaction for our not keeping them. And this is the great Case (so oft by Christ described *Mat.* 7. & 25. *&c.*) to be decided in judgment; and therefore the word *Righteous* and *Righteousness* are used for what

what is thus personal hundreds of times in Scripture.

§ 24. But as to the question, *Have we kept* the *Law of Innocency*? we must confess guilt and say, No: neither Immediately by our selves, nor Mediately by another, or Instrument: for *Personal Obedience* only is the performance required by that Law; Therefore we have no *Righteousness* consisting in such Performance or Innocency; but must confess sin, and plead a pardon.

§ 25. Therefore no man hath a proper *Universal Righteousness*, excluding all kind of Guilt whatsoever.

§ 26. Therefore no man is justified by the Law of Innocency (nor the Law Mosaical as of works;) either by the Preceptive or Retributive part: for we broke the Precept, and are by the Threatning heirs of death.

§ 27. That Law doth not justifie us, because Christ fulfilled it for us: For it said not (in words or sense) [Thou or one for thee shall *Perfectly Obey*, or *Suffer*:] It mentioned no Substitute: But it is the Law-giver (and not that Law) that justifieth us by other means.

§ 28. But we have *another Righteousness imputed* to us *instead of that Perfect Legal Innocency* and *Rewardableness*, by which we shall be *accepted of God*, and *glorified* at last as surely and fully (at least) as if we had never sinned, or had perfectly kept that Law; which therefore may be called our *Pro-legal Righteousness*.

§ 29. But this Righteousness is not yet either OURS by such a propriety as a Personal performance would have bin, nor OURS to all the same

ends and purpoſes: It ſaveth us not from all pain, death or penal deſertion, nor conſtituteth our Relation juſt the ſame.

§ 30. It is the Law of Grace that Juſtifieth us, both as giving us Righteouſneſs, and as *Virtually judging* us Righteous when it hath made us ſo, and it is Chriſt as Judg according to that Law (and God by Chriſt) that will *ſentence* us juſt, and *executively* ſo uſe us.

§ 31. The Grace of Chriſt firſt giveth us *Faith* and *Repentance* by effectual Vocation: And then the Law of Grace by its *Donative* part or Act doth give us a *Right* to *Union* with Chriſt as the Churches Head (and ſo to his Body) and with him a right to Pardon of paſt ſin, and to the Spirit to dwell and act in us for the future, and to the Love of God, and Life eternal, to be ours in poſſeſſion, if we ſincerely obey and perſevere.

§ 32. The total Righteouſneſs then which we have (as an Accident of which we are the Subjects,) is 1. A right to Impunity, by the free Pardon of all our ſins, and a right to Gods Favour and Glory, as a free gift *quoad valorem*, but as a *Reward* of our Obedience, *quoad Ordinem conferendi & rationem Comparativam* (why one rather than another is judged meet for that free gift.) 2. And the *Relation* of one that hath by grace performed the Condition of that free Gift, without which we had been no capable recipients: which is initially [Faith and Repentance] the Condition of our Right begun, and conſequently, ſincere Obedience and Perſeverance (the Condition of continued right.)

§ 33. Chriſts perſonal Righteouſneſs is no one of theſe, and ſo is not our *Conſtitutive Righteouſneſs* for-

formally and ſtrictly ſo called: For *Formally* our Righteouſneſs is a *Relation*, (of right;) and it is the Relation of our own Perſons: And a Relation is an accident: And the numerical Relation (or Right) of one perſon cannot be the ſame numerical Accident of another perſon as the ſubject.

§ 34. There are but three ſorts of *Cauſes*; *Efficient*, *Conſtitutive*, and *Final*.

1. Chriſt is the efficient cauſe of all our Righteouſneſs: (1. Of our Right to Pardon and Life; 2. And of our Goſpel Obedience:) And that many waies: 1. He is the Meritorious Cauſe: 2. He is the *Donor* by his Covenant; 3. And the Donor or Operator of our Inherent Righteouſneſs by his Spirit: 4. And the moral efficient by his Word, Promiſe, Example, &c.

2. And Chriſt is partly the final cauſe.

3. But all the doubt is whether his perſonal Righteouſneſs be the *Conſtitutive Cauſe*.

§ 35. The *Conſtitutive Cauſe* of natural bodily ſubſtances conſiſteth of *Matter diſpoſed*, and *Form*. Relations have no *Matter*, but inſtead of *Matter* a *Subject* (and that is *Our own perſons* here, and not Chriſt.) and a *terminus* and *fundamentum*.

§ 36. The *Fundamentum* may be called both the *Efficient Cauſe* of the *Relation* (as commonly it is) and the *Matter* from which it *reſulteth*: And ſo Chriſts Righteouſneſs is undoubtedly the *Meritorious* efficient Cauſe, and undoubtedly not the *Formal* Cauſe of our perſonal Relation of Righteouſneſs: Therefore all the doubt is of the Material Cauſe.

§ 37. So that all the Controverſie is come up to a bare *name* and Logical term, of which Logicians agree not as to the aptitude. All confeſs that Rela-

lations have no proper *Matter*, besides the subject: all confess that the *Fundamentum* is *loco efficientis*, but whether it be a fit name to call it the *Constitutive Matter* of a Relation, there is no agreement.

§ 38. And if there were, it would not decide this Verbal Controversie: For 1. *Titulus est fundamentum Juris*: The *fundamentum* of our *Right to Impunity and Life* in and with Christ, is the *Donative act* of our Saviour in and by his Law or Covenant of Grace: that is our *Title*; And from that our Relation resulteth, the *Conditio tituli vel juris* being found in our selves. 2. And our Relation of *Performers* of that Condition of the Law of Grace, resulteth from our own performance as the *fundamentum* (compared to the Rule.) So that both these parts of our Righteousness have a nearer *fundamentum* than Christs personal Righteousness.

§ 39. But the *Right* given us by the Covenant (and the Spirit and Grace) being a Right merited first by Christs personal Righteousness, this is a *Causa Causæ*, *id est*, *fundamenti*, *seu Donationis*: And while this much is certain, whether it shall be called a *Remote fundamentum* (*viz. Causa fundamenti*) and so a Remote Constitutive Material Cause, or only (properly) a Meritorious Cause, may well be left to the arbitrary Logician, that useeth such notions as he pleases; but verily is a Controversie unfit to tear the Church for, or destroy Love and Concord by.

§ 40. Quest. 1. *Is Christs Righteousness OURS?* *Ans.* Yes; In some sense, and in another not.

§ 41. Quest. 2. *Is Christs Righteousness OURS?* *Ans.* Yes; In the sense before opened; For *all things are ours*; and his righteousness more than lower Causes.

§ 2. Quest.

§ 42. Queſt. 3. *Is Chriſts Righteouſneſs OURS as it was or is His own, with the ſame ſort of propriety?* *Anſ.* No.

§ 43. Queſt. 4. *Is the formal Relation of Righteous as an accident of our perſons, numerically the ſame Righteouſneſs?* Anſ. No; It is impoſſible: Unleſs we are the ſame perſon.

§ 44. Queſt. 5. *Is Chriſt and each Believer one political perſon? Anſ.* A political perſon is an equivocal word: If you take it for *an Office* (as the King or Judg is a political perſon) I ſay, No: If for a *Society*, *Yea*; But *noxia & noxa caput ſequuntur*: True *Guilt* is an accident of natural perſons, and of Societies only as conſtituted of ſuch; and ſo is Righteouſneſs; Though Phyſically Good or Evil may for ſociety-ſake, befal us without perſonal deſert or conſent.

But if by [*Perſon*] you mean a certain *State or Condition* (as to be a *ſubject of God*, or one that is to *ſuffer for ſin*) ſo Chriſt may be ſaid to be the ſame *perſon* with us *in ſpecie*, but not *numerically*; becauſe that Accident whence his *Perſonality* is named, is not in the ſame ſubject.

§ 45. Queſt. 6. *Is Chriſts Righteouſneſs imputed to us? Anſ.* Yes; If by imputing you mean reckoning or reputing it ours, ſo far as is aforeſaid, that is ſuch a Cauſe of ours.

§ 46. Queſt. 7. *Are we reputed our ſelves to have fulfilled all that Law of Innocency in and by Chriſt, as repreſenting our perſons, as obeying by him?* Anſ. No.

§ 47. Queſt. 8. *Is it Chriſts Divine, Habitual, Active or Paſſive Righteouſneſs which Juſtifieth us? Anſ.* All: viz, the Habitual, Active and Paſſive exalted in Meritoriouſneſs by Union with the Divine.

§ 48. Queſt. 9. *Is it Chriſts Righteouſneſs, or our Faith which is ſaid to be imputed to us for Righteouſneſs* ? Rom. 4. *Anſ.* 1. The text ſpeaketh of imputing Faith, and by Faith is meant Faith, and not *Chriſts* Righteouſneſs in the word : But that Faith is *Faith in Chriſt* and his Righteouſneſs ; and the Object is *quaſi materia actus*, and covenanted.

2. *De re*, both are Imputed : that is, 1. Chriſts Righteouſneſs is reputed the meritorious Cauſe. 2. The *free-gift* (by the Covenant) is reputed the *fundamentum juris* (both oppoſed to our Legal Merit.) 3. And our Faith is *reputed* the *Conditio tituli*, and all that is required in us to our Juſtification, as making us *Qualified Recipients* of the *free-Gift* merited by Chriſt.

§ 49. Queſt. 10. *Are we any way Juſtified by our own performed Righteouſneſs* ? *Anſ.* Yes ; Againſt the charge of non-performance, (as Infidels, Impenitent, Unholy,) and ſo as being uncapable of the free-giſt of Pardon and Life in Chriſt.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

The Reasons of our denying the fore-described rigid sence of Imputation.

Though it were most accurate to reduce what we deny to several Propositions, and to confute each one argumentatively by it self, yet I shall now choose to avoid such prolixity; and for brevity and the satisfaction of such as look more at the force of a Reason, than the form of the Argument, I shall thrust together our denyed Sence, with the manifold Reasons of our denyal.

"WE deny, that God doth so Impute Christs "Righteousness to us, as to repute or ac- "count us to have been Holy with all that Habitu- "al Holiness which was in Christ, or to have done "all that he did in obedience to his Father, or in "fulfilling the Law, or to have suffered all that he "suffered, and to have made God satisfaction for "our own sins, and merited our own Salvation and "Justification, in and by Christ; or that he *was*, "*did* and *suffered*, and *merited*, all this strictly in "the *person* of every sinner that is saved; Or that "Christs very individual Righteousness Material or "Formal, is so made ours in a strict sense, as that "we are Proprietors, Subjects, or Agents of the "very

" very thing it self simply and absolutely, as it is
" distinct from the effects ; or that Christs Indivi-
" dual Formal Righteousness, is made our Formal
" Personal Righteousness ; or that as to the *effects*,
" we have any such Righteousness Imputed to us,
" as formally ours, which consisteth in a perfect Ha-
" bitual and Actual Conformity to the Law of In-
" nocency ; that is, that we are reputed perfectly
" Holy and sinless, and such as shall be Justified by
" the Law of Innocency, which saith, *Perfectly Obey*
" and *Live*, or *sin and die.*] All this we deny.

Let him that will answer me, keep to my words, and not alter the sense by leaving any out. And that he may the better understand me, I add, 1. I take it for granted that the Law requireth Habitual Holiness as well as Actual Obedience, and is not fulfilled without both. 2. That Christ loved God and man with a perfect constant Love, and never sinned by Omission or Commission. 3. That Christ died not only for our Original sin, or sin before Conversion, but for all our sin to our lives end. 4. That he who is supposed to have no sin of Omission, is supposed to have done all his duty. 5. That he that hath done all his duty, is not condemnable by that Law, yea hath right to all the Reward promised on Condition of that duty. 6. By Christs Material Righteousness, I mean, those Habits, Acts and Sufferings in which his Righteousness did consist, or was founded. 7. By his and our *Formal Righteousness*, I mean the *Relation* it self of being *Righteous*. 8. And I hold that Christs Righteousness, did not only *Numerically* (as aforesaid) but also thus *totâ specie*, in kind differ from ours, that his was a *perfect Habitual and Actual Conformity to the Law*

Law of Innocency, together with the peculiar Laws of Mediator-ship, by which he merited Redemption for us, and Glory for himself and us: But ours is the Pardon of sin, and Right to Life, Purchased, Merited and freely given us by Christ in and by a new Covenant, whose condition is Faith with Repentance, as to the gift of our Justification now, and sincere Holiness, Obedience, Victory and Perseverance as to our possession of Glory.

Now our Reasons against the denyed sence of Imputation are these.

1. In general this opinion setteth up and introduceth all Antinomianism or Libertinism, and Ungodliness, and subverteth the Gospel and all true Religion and Morality.

I do not mean that all that hold it, have such effects in themselves, but only that this is the tendency and consequence of the opinion: For I know that many see not the nature and consequences of their own opinions, and the abundance that hold damnable errors, hold them but notionally in a peevish faction, and therefore not dammingly, but hold practically and effectually the contrary saving truth. And if the Papists shall perswade Men that our doctrine, yea theirs that here mistake, cannot consist with a godly life, let but the lives of Papists and Protestants be compared. Yea in one of the Instances before given; Though some of the Congregational-party hold what was recited, yet so far are they from ungodly lives, that the greatest thing in which I differ from them is, the overmuch unscriptural strictness of some of them, in their Church-admissions and Communion, while they fly further from such as they think not godly, than I think God would

would have them do, being generally persons fearing God themselves: (Excepting the sinful alienation from others, and easiness to receive and carry false reports of Dissenters, which is common to all that fall into sidings.) But the errors of any men are never the better if they be found in the hands of godly men: For if they be practised they will make them ungodly.

2. It confoundeth the *Person* of the *Mediator*, and of the *Sinner*: As if the Mediator who was proclaimed the Beloved of the Father, and therefore capable of reconciling us to him, because he was still *well-pleased* in him, had (not only suffered in the room of the sinner by voluntary Sponsion, but also) in suffering and doing, been *Civilly* the very person of the sinner himself; that sinner I say, who was an enemy to God, and so esteemed.

3. It maketh Christ to have *been Civilly* as *many persons* as there be elect sinners in the World: which is both beside and contrary to Scripture.

4. It introduceth a false sence and supposition of our sin imputed to Christ, as if Imputatively it were his as it is ours, even the *sinful Habits*, the *sinful Acts*, and the *Relation* of *evil*, *Wicked*, *Ungodly* and *Unrighteous* which resulteth from them: And so it maketh Christ really *hated of God*: For God cannot but *hate* any one whom he reputeth to be truly ungodly, a Hater of God, an Enemy to him, a Rebel, as we all were: whereas it was only the Guilt of Punishment, and not of *Crime*, as such that Christ assumed: He undertook to suffer in the room of sinners; and to be reputed one that had so undertaken; But not to be reputed really a sinner, an ungodly person, hater of God, one that had the Image of the Devil.

5. Nay

5. Nay it maketh Christ to have been incomparably the worst man that ever was in the World by just reputation; and to have been by just imputation guilty of all the sins of all the Elect that ever lived, and reputed one of the Murderers of himself, and *one* of the Persecutors of his Church, or rather *many*: and the language that *Luther* used Catechrestically, to be strictly and properly true.

6. It supposeth a wrong sence of the Imputation of *Adams* sin to his posterity: As if we had been justly reputed *persons existent* in *his person*, and so in him to have been *persons that commited the same sin*; whereas we are only reputed to be *now* (not *then*) *persons* who have a *Nature* derived from him, which being then *seminally only* in him, deriveth by propagation an answerable *Guilt* of his sinful fact, together with *natural Corruption*.

7. It supposeth us to be Justifiable and Justified by the Law of Innocency, made to *Adam*, as it saith [*Obey perfectly and Live.*] As if we fulfilled it by Christ: which is not only an addition to the Scripture, but a Contradiction. For it is only the Law or Covenant of Grace that we are Justified by.

8. It putteth, to that end, a false sence upon the Law of Innocency: For whereas it commandeth *Personal Obedience*, and maketh *Personal* punishment *due* to the offender: This supposeth the Law to say or mean [*Either thou, or one for thee shall Obey*; or, *Thou shalt obey by thy self, or by another*: And *if thou sin thou shalt suffer by thy self, or by another.*

Whereas the Law knew no Substitute or Vicar, no nor Sponsor; nor is any such thing said of it in the Scripture: so bold are men in their additions.

9. It falsly supposeth that we are not Judged and Justi-

Justified by the new Covenant or Law of Grace, but (but is said) by the Law of Innocency.

10. It fathereth on God an erring judgment, as if he reputed, reckoned or accounted things to be what they are not, and us to have done what we did not. To repute Christ a Sponsor for sinners who undertook to obey in their natures, and suffer in their place and stead, as a Sacrifice to redeem them, is all just and true: And to repute *us those* for whom Christ did this. But to repute Christ to have been really and every one of us, or a sinner, or guilty of sin it self; or to repute us to have been habitually as Good as Christ was, or actually to have done what he did, either Naturally or Civilly and by Him as our substitute, and to repute us Righteous by possessing his formal personal Righteousness in it self; All these are untrue, and therefore not to be ascribed to God. To Impute it to us, is but to Repute us as verily and groundedly Righteous by his Merited and freely-Given Pardon, and Right to Life, as if we had merited it our selves.

11. It feigneth the same Numerical Accident [their *Relation* of *Righteousness*] which was in one subject to be in another, which is Impossible.

12. It maketh us to have satisfied Divine Justice for our selves, and merited Salvation (and all that we receive) for our selves, in and by another: And so that we may plead our own Merits with God for Heaven and all his benefits.

13. The very making and tenor of the new Covenant, contradicteth this opinion: For when God maketh a Law or Covenant, to convey the effects of Christs Righteousnes to us, by degrees and upon certain Conditions, this proveth that the very Righ-

Righteousness in it self simply was not ours: else we should have had these effects of it both presently and immediately and absolutely without new Conditions.

14. This opinion therefore maketh this Law of Grace, which giveth the benefits to us by these degrees and upon terms, to be an *injury* to Believers, as keeping them from their own.

15. It seemeth to deny Christs Legislation in the Law of Grace, and consequently his Kingly Office. For if we are reputed to have fulfilled the whole Law of Innocency in Christ, there is no business for the Law of Grace to do.

16. It seemeth to make internal Sanctification by the Spirit needless, or at least, as to one half of its use: For if we are by just Imputation in Gods account perfectly Holy, in Christs Holiness the first moment of our believing, nothing can be added to Perfection; we are as fully *Amiable* in the sight of God, as if we were sanctified in our selves; Because by Imputation it is all our own.

17. And so it seemeth to make our after-Obedience unnecessary, at least as to half its use: For if in Gods true account, we have perfectly obeyed to the death by another, how can we be required to do it all or part again by our selves? If all the debt of our Obedience be paid, why is it required again?

18. And this seemeth to Impute to God a nature less holy and at enmity to sin, than indeed he hath; if he can repute a man laden with hateful sins, to be as perfecty Holy, Obedient and Amiable to him as if he were really so in himself, because another is such for him.

19. If we did in our own persons Imputatively what

what Christ did, I think it will follow that we *sinned*; that being unlawful to us which was Good in him. It is a sin for us to be Circumcised, and to keep all the Law of *Moses*, and send forth Apostles, and to make Church-Ordinances needful to Salvation. Therefore we did not this in Christ: And if not this, they that distinguish and tell us what we did in Christ, and what not, must prove it. I know that Christ did somewhat which is a common duty of all men, and somewhat proper to the *Jews*, and somewhat proper to himself: But that one sort of men did one part in Christ, and another sort did another part in him, is to be proved.

20. If Christ suffered but in the Person of sinful man, his sufferings would have been in vain, or no Satisfaction to God: For sinful man is obliged to perpetual punishment; of which a temporal one is but a small part: *Our persons* cannot make a temporal suffering equal to that perpetual one due to man: but the transcendent person of the Mediator did.

Obj. *Christ bore both his own person and ours: It belongeth to him as Mediator to personate the guilty sinner.*

Ans. It belongeth to him as Mediator to undertake the sinners punishment in his own person. And if any will improperly call that, the *Personating and Representing* of the *sinner*, let them limit it, and confess that it is not *simply*, but *in tantum*, so far, and to such uses and no other, and that yet *sinners did it not in* and *by Christ*, but only Christ for them to convey the benefits as he pleased; And then we delight not to quarrel about mere words; though we like the phrase of Scripture better than theirs.

21. If

21. If Christ was perfectly Holy and Obedient in our persons, and we in him, then it was either in the Person of Innocent man before we sinned, or of sinful man. The first cannot be pretended: For man as Innocent had not a Redeemer. If of *sinful man*, then his perfect Obedience could not be meritorious of our Salvation: For it supposeth him to do it in the person of a sinner: and he that hath once sinned, according to that Law, is the Child of death, and uncapable of ever fulfilling a Law, which is fulfilled with nothing but sinless perfect perpetual Obedience.

Obj. *He first suffered in our stead and persons as sinners, and then our sin being pardoned, he after in our persons fulfilled the Law, instead of our after-Obedience to it.*

Ans. 1. Christs Obedience to the Law was before his Death. 2. The sins which he suffered for, were not only before Conversion, but endure as long as our lives: Therefore if he fulfilled the Law in our persons after we have done sinning, it is in the persons only of the dead. 3. We are still obliged to Obedience our selves.

Obj. *But yet though there be no such difference in Time, God doth first Impute his sufferings to us for pardon of all our sins to the death, and in order of nature, his Obedience after it, as the Merit of our Salvation.*

Ans. 1. God doth Impute or Repute his sufferings the satisfying cause of our Pardon, and his Merits of Suffering and the rest of his Holiness and Obedience, as the meritorious cause of our *Pardon* and our Justification and Glory without dividing them. But 2. that implyeth that we did not our selves re-

putatively do all this in Christ: As shall be further proved.

22. Their way of Imputation of the Satisfaction of Christ, overthroweth their own doctrine of the Imputation of his Holiness and Righteousness. For if all sin be fully pardoned by the Imputed Satisfaction, then sins of *Omission* and of habitual Privation and Corruption are pardoned; and then the whole punishment both of *Sense* and *Loss* is remitted: And he that hath no sin of Omission or Privation, is a perfect doer of his duty, and holy; and he that hath no punishment of Loss, hath title to Life, according to that Covenant which he is reputed to have perfectly obeyed. And so he is an heir of life, without any Imputed Obedience upon the pardon of all his Disobedience.

Obj. *But* Adam *must have obeyed to the Death if he would have Life eternal: Therefore the bare pardon of his sins did not procure his right to life.*

Ans. True, if you suppose that only his first sin was pardoned: But 1. *Adam* had right to heaven as long as he was sinless. 2. Christ dyed for all *Adams* sins to the last breath, and not for the first only: And so he did for all ours. And if all the sins of omission to the death be pardoned, Life is due to us as righteous.

Obj. *A Stone may be sinless, and yet not righteous nor have Right to life.*

Ans. True: because it is not a capable subject. But a man cannot be sinless, but he is Righteous, and hath right to life by Covenant.

Obj. *But not to punish is one thing and to Reward is another?*

Ans. They are distinct formal Relations and Notions:

tions: But where *felicity is a Gift* and called a *Reward* only for the *terms* and *order* of Collation, and where *Innocency* is the same with *perfect Duty*, and is the title-Condition; there to be punished is to be *denyed* the *Gift*, and to be *Rewarded* is to have that *Gift* as qualified persons: and not to *Reward*, is materially to *punish*; and to be reputed innocent is to be reputed a Meriter. And it is impossible that the most Innocent man can have any thing from God, but by way of free-Gift as to the *Thing* in Value; however it may be merited in point of Governing Paternal Justice as to the *Order* of donation.

Obj. *But there is a greater Glory merited by Christ, than the Covenant of works promised to man.*

Ans. 1. That's another matter, and belongeth not to Justification, but to Adoption. 2. Christs Sufferings as well as his Obedience, considered as meritorious, did purchase that greater Glory. 3. We did not purchase or merit it in Christ, but Christ for us.

23. Their way of Imputation seemeth to me to leave no place or possibility for Pardon of sin, or at least of no sin after Conversion. I mean, that according to their opinion who think that we fulfilled the Law in Christ as we are elect from eternity, it leaveth no place for any pardon: And according to their opinion who say that we fulfilled it in him as *Believers*, it leaveth no place for pardon of any sin after Faith. For where the Law is reputed perfectly fulfilled (in Habit & Act) there it is reputed that the person hath no sin. We had no sin before we had a Being; and if we are reputed to have perfectly obeyed in Christ from our first Being, we are reputed sinless. But if we are reputed to have obeyed in

him only since our believing, then we are reputed to have no sin since our Believing. Nothing excludeth sin, if perfect Habitual and Actual Holiness and Obedience do not.

24. And consequently Christs blood shed and Satisfaction is made vain, either as to all our lives, or to all after our first believing.

25. And then no believer must confess his sin, nor his desert of punishment nor repent of it, or be humbled for it.

26. And then all prayer for the pardon of such sin is vain, and goeth upon a false supposition, that we have sin to pardon.

27. And then no man is to be a partaker of the Sacrament as a Conveyance or Seal of such pardon; nor to believe the promise for it.

28. Nor is it a duty to *give thanks* to God or Christ for any such pardon.

29. Nor can we expect Justification from such *guilt* here or at *Judgment*.

30. And then those in Heaven praise Christ in errour, when they magnifie him that washed them from such sins in his blood.

31. And it would be no lie to say that we have no sin, at least, since believing.

32. Then no believer should *fear sinning*, because it is *Impossible* and a *Contradiction*, for the same person to be perfectly innocent to the death, and yet a sinner.

33. Then the Consciences of believers have no work to do, or at least, no examining, convincing, self-accusing and self-judging work.

34. This chargeth God by Consequence of wronging all believers whom he layeth the least punishment

niſhment upon: For he that hath perfectly obeyed, or hath perfectly ſatisfied, by himſelf or by another in his perſon, cannot juſtly be puniſhed. But I have elſewhere fully proved, that Death and other Chaſtiſements are puniſhments, though not deſtructive, but corrective: And ſo is the permiſſion of our further ſinning.

35. It intimateth that God wrongeth believers, for not giving them immediately more of the Holy Ghoſt, and not preſent perfecting them and freeing them from all ſin: For though Chriſt may give us the fruits of his own merits in the time and way that pleaſeth himſelf; yet if it be *we our ſelves* that have perfectly ſatisfied and *merited in Chriſt*, we have preſent Right to the thing merited thereupon, and it is an injury to deny it us at all.

36. And accordingly it would be an injury to keep them ſo long out of Heaven, if they themſelves did merit it ſo long ago.

37. And the very *Threatning* of Puniſhment in the Law of Grace would ſeem injurious or incongruous, to them that have already reputatively obeyed perfectly to the death.

38. And there would be no place left for any Reward from God, to any act of obedience done by our ſelves in our natural or real perſon: Becauſe having reputatively fulfilled all Righteouſneſs, and deſerved all that we are capable of by another, our own acts can have no reward.

39. And I think this would overthrow all Humane Laws and Government: For all true Governours are the Officers of God, and do what they do in ſubordination to God; and therefore cannot

juſtly puniſh any man, whom he pronounceth erfectly Innocent to the death.

40. This maketh every believer (at leaſt) as Righteous as Chriſt himſelf, as having true propriety in all the ſame numerical Righteouſneſs as his own. And if we be as Righteous as Chriſt, are we not as amiable to God? And may we not go to God in our Names as Righteous?

41. This maketh all believers (at leaſt) *equally Righteous* in degree, and every one *perfect*, and no difference between them. *David* and *Solomon* as Righteous in the act of ſinning as before, and every weak and ſcandalous believer, to be as Righteous as the beſt. Which is not true, though many ſay that Juſtification hath no degrees, but is perfect at firſt; as I have proved in my *Life of Faith* and elſewhere.

42. This too much levelleth Heaven and Earth; For in Heaven there can be nothing greater than perfection.

43. The Scripture no-where calleth our Imputed Righteouſneſs by the name of Innocency, or ſinleſs Perfection, nor Inculpability Imputed. Nay when the very phraſe of *Imputing Chriſts* Righteouſneſs is not there at all, to add all theſe wrong deſcriptions of Imputation, is ſuch Additions to Gods words as tendeth to let in almoſt any thing that mans wit ſhall excogitate, and ill beſeemeth them, that are for Scripture-ſufficiency and perfection, and againſt Additions in the general. And whether ſome may not ſay, that we are Imputatively Chriſt himſelf, Conceived by the Holy Ghoſt, Born of the Virgin Mary, ſuffered under Pontius Pilate, Crucified, &c. I cannot tell.

To

To conclude, the honeſt plain Chriſtian may without diſquieting the Church or himſelf, be ſatisfied in this certain ſimple truth; That we are ſinners and deſerve everlaſting miſery: That Chriſt hath ſuffered as a Sacrifice for our ſins in our room and ſtead, and ſatisfied the Juſtice of God: That he hath by his perfect Holineſs and Obedience with thoſe ſufferings, merited our pardon and life: That he never hereby intended to make us Lawleſs or have us Holy, but hath brought us under a Law of Grace: which is the Inſtrument by which he pardoneth, juſtifieth and giveth us Right to life: That by this Covenant he requireth of us Repentance and true Faith to our firſt Juſtification, and ſincere Obedience, Holineſs and Perſeverance to our Glorification, to be wrought by his Grace and our Wills excited and enabled by it: That Chriſts Sufferings are to ſave us from ſuffering; but his Holineſs and Obedience are to merit Holineſs, Obedience & Happineſs for us, that we may be like him, and ſo be made perſonally amiable to God: But both his Sufferings and Obedience, do bring us under a Covenant, where Perfection is not neceſſary to our Salvation.

CHAP. V.

The Objections Answered.

" Obj. 1. *YOU confound a Natural and a Politi-*
" *cal person: Christ and the several be-*
" *lieving sinners are not the same natural Person, but*
" *they are the same Political. As are with us,* saith
" Dr. Tullie, *the Sponsor and the Debtor, the Attor-*
" *ney and the Clyent, the Tutor and the Pupil; so are*
" *all the faithful in Christ, both as to their Celestial*
" *regenerate nature, of which he is the first Father, who*
" *begetteth sons by his Spirit and seed of the Word to his*
" *Image, and as to Righteousness derived by Legal*
" *Imputation. Vid.* Dr. Tullie, Justif. Paul. p. 80, 81.
" *It's commonly said that Christ as our surety is our*
" *Person.*

Ans. 1. The distinction of a *Person* into *Natural* and *Political* or *Legal*, is *equivoci in sua equivocata*: He therefore that would not have contention cherished and men taught to damn each other for a word not understood, must give us leave to ask what these equivocals mean. What a *Natural Person* signifieth, we are pretty well agreed; but a *Political Person* is a word not so easily and commonly understood. *Calvin* tells us that *Persona definitur homo qui caput habet civile.* (For *omnis persona est homo, sed non vicissim: Homo cum est vocabulum naturæ; Persona juris civilis.*) And so (as *Albenius*) *civitas, municipium, Castrum, Collegium, Universitas, & quodlibet corpus, Personæ appellatione continetur; ut Spigel.*

gel. But if this Definition be commensurate to the common nature of a civil person, then a King can be none; nor any one that hath not a *civil head.* This therefore is too narrow. The same *Calvin* (*in n. Personæ*) tells us, that *Seneca Personam vocat, cum præ se fert aliquis, quod non est*; A Counterfeit: But sure this is not the sence of the Objectors. In general saith *Calvin*, *Tam hominem quam qualitatem hominis, seu Conditionem significat.* But it is not sure every *Quality* or *Condition*: *Calvin* therefore giveth us nothing satisfactory, to the decision of the Controversie which these Divines will needs make, whether each believer and Christ be the same Political Person. *Martinius* will make our Controversie no easier by the various significations gathered out of *Vet. Vocab. Gel. Scaliger, Valla*; Which he thus enumerateth. 1. *Persona est accidens conditio hominis, qualitas quâ homo differt ab homine, tum in animo, tum in corpore, tum in externis.* 2. *Homo qualitate dictâ proditus*: 3. *Homo insigni qualitate præditus habens gradum eminentiæ, in Ecclesia Dei, &c.* 4. *Figura. seu facies ficta, larva histrionica, &c.* 5. *Ille qui sub hujusmodi figura aliquam representat, &c.* 6. *Figura eminens in ædificiis quæ ore aquam fundit, &c. Individua substantia humana, seu singularis homo.* 8. *Individua substantia Intelligens quælibet.* Now which of these is *Persona Politica vel Legalis.* Let us but agree what we mean by the word and I suppose we shall find that we are agreed of the Matter. When I deny the *Person* of Christ and the sinner to have been the same, or to be so reputed by God, I mean by *Person*, univocally or properly, An *Individual Intelligent Substance.* And they that mean otherwise are obliged to Define; For *Analogum per*

se

se positum stat pro suo significato famosiore. If they mean that Christ and the Believer are the same as to some *Quality*, or *Condition*, let them tell us what Quality or Condition it is, and I think we shall be found to be of one mind.

But I think by the similitudes of a *Sponsor*, *Attorney*, and *Guardian*, that they mean by a *Political Person* (not as a *society*, nor such as agree *in Quality*, but) *A natural Person so related to another Natural person, as that what he doth and suffereth, Is or Hath, is limitedly to certain ends and uses as effectual as if that other person himself did and suffered, Were or Had numerically the same thing.* I obtrude not a sense on others, but must know theirs before I can know where we differ. And if this be the meaning, we are agreed: Thus far (though I greatly dislike their way that lay much stress on such humane phrases,) I grant the thing meant by them. Christs Holiness Habitual and Actual, and his Merits and Satisfaction are as effectual to a believers Justification and Salvation upon the terms of the Covenant of Grace (which is sealed by baptism) as if we had been, done and suffered the same our selves. But still remember that this is only [*limitedly*] to *these uses*, and on these *termes* and no other, and I think that this is the meaning of most Divines that use this phrase.

But the sense of those men that I differ from and write against (the *Libertines* and *Antinomians*, and some others that own not those names,) is this: that *A Legal Person is one so Related to anothers Natural person as that what he Hath, Doth, or Suffereth in such a case*, is (not only effectual as aforesaid to others, but) *is in itself simply Reputed or Imputed to be Morally, though not physically, the Habit, Act and Suffering,*

Suffering, the Merit and Satisfactory Sacrifice of the other person: And so being the reputed Haver, Doer or *Sufferer, Meriter* or *Satisfyer himself, he hath absolute right to all the proper results or benefits.*

And so a man may indeed many ways among us *Represent* or *Personate* another. If I by Law am Commanded to do this or that service *per meipsum aut per alium*, I do it in the Moral or Law-sence, because the other doth it in my name and I am allowed so to do it. So if I appear or answer by any Proctor or Attorney; if the Law make it equal to my personal appearance and answer, it is said that *I did it by him*: (but only so far as he doth it as my *Representer* or *in my name*): So if I pay a debt by the hand of *my Servant* or any Messenger, if so allowed, I do it by that other. So indeed a Pupil, doth by his Guardian what his Guardian doth, only so far as the Law obligeth him to consent or stand to it.

We did not thus our selves fulfil all the Law in and by Christ; Nor are we *thus* the *Proprietors* of his *Habitual* perfection, *Merits or Satisfaction.*

The common reason given by the contrary-minded is, that he was our *Surety*, or *Sponsor*, or *fidejussor*: and so we translate ἔγγυος *Heb.* 7. 22. and I remember not any other text of Scripture allegable for that title. But this word doth not necessarily signifie any such *Representer of our Persons* as aforesaid. Nay when he is called thus the *fidejussor of a better Covenant*, it seemeth plain that it is Gods Covenant as such, and so Gods *Sponsor* that is meant; and as *Grotius* saith *Moses pro Deo sponsor. dit in Lege Veteri: Jesus pro Deo in Lege Nova: Lex utraque & pactum continet, promissa habet. Sponsorem dare solent minus nati; & Moses & Deus homini-*

bus

bus melius nati erant quam Deus qui inconspicuus. So also Dr. *Hamond* [*He was Sponsor and Surety for God, that it should be made good to us on Gods part, on Condition that we performed that which was required of us:*] And here they that translate διαθήκη a Testament, never intended that it was our *Part* of the Covenant that is meant by a *Testament*: But (the most Judicious expositor,) "Mr. *Lawson* on the "text, truly saith [The Scriptures of *Moses* and the "Prophets translated into Greek will tell us; That "διαθήκη always signifieth a Law or a Covenant, "and for the most part both: so it doth in the "writings of the Apostles and Evangelists where it "seldom signifieth the last Will and Testament of a "man. The same thing is a Law in respect of the "precepts, &c. Ἐγγυᾶς turned Surety signifieth "one that undertaketh for another to see something "paid or performed: And though the word is not "found in the New Testament except in this place, "&c. But *Varnius* tells us that Ἐγγυᾶς is Μεσίτης, "a Mediator; and so it is taken here as it's ex- "pounded by the Apostle in the Chapter following: "And because a Priest doth undertake to procure "from God, both the Confirmation and performance "of the promises to the people, and to that end me- "diates between both; therefore he is a Surety and "Mediator of the Covenant, and in this respect the "Surety and Mediator of the Covenant is a Priest.]

So *Calvin* (though almost passing it by) seemeth to intimate that which I think is the truth, that Christ is called Ἐγγυᾶς of Gods Covenant from the *sacerdotal appropinquation*, mentioned *vers.* 19. &c.

"And *Marlorate* after *Theophylact*, *Sponsorem pro Me-* "*diatore & intercessore posuit.*

"So

" So *Paræus in loc. Est novi fœderis Sponsor Christus,* " *quia novum fœdus sanguine & morte sua obsignavit.*

So the *Dutch Annot.* and many others, besides the Ancients, by a *Sponsor*, tell us is meant a *Mediator.*

And we grant that a Mediator is *not of one*, but doth somewhat on the behalf of *both parties.* But that as Mediator he Is, Hath, Doth, Suffereth, Merit-teth, Satisfyeth; so as the Representer or person of each believer, as that every such Person is supposed in Law to have *Been*, *Done*, *Suffered*, *Merited*, thus in and by the *Mediator*, is neither signified by this or any other text.

2. And they that distinguish of a Natural and Political Person, do but darken the case by an ill-expressed distinction, which indeed is not of two sorts of *Persons*, but between *Reality* and *Acceptation*, taking *Person* properly for *a Natural Person*: It's one thing to be such a *Person*, and another thing to have the *Act*, *Passion*, *Merit*, &c. *Accepted* for that other *Person*: And this latter signifieth, either 1. That it was done by *the other person mediately*, as being *a cheif Cause acting by his Instrument.* 2. Or that it was *done for that other Person* by another. The first is our denyed sence, and the second our affirmed sence.

Among us *Sureties* and *Sponsors* are of several sorts: *Grotius de Jure Belli* tells you of another sense of *Sponsion* in the Civil Law, than is pertinent to the objectors use: And in Baptism the same word, hath had divers senses as used by persons of different intentions. The time was when the Sponsor was not at all taken for the *Political Person* (as you call it) of *Parent* or *Child*, nor spake as *their Instrument*, in *their name*: But was a Third person,

who

who (because many parents *Apostatized*, and more *Died* in the Childs minority) did pass his word, 1. *That the Parent was a credible Person*, 2. That if he *Dyed* so soon or *Apostatized*, he himself would undertake the Christian Education of the Child. But the *Parent* himself was *Sponsor for the Child* in a stricter sense, (as also Adopting Pro-parents were, & as some take God-fathers to be now,) that is, they were taken for such, whose Reason, will and word, we authorised to dispose of the Child as obligingly, as if it had been done by his own reason will and word, so be it, it were but *For his good*, and the Child did own it when he came to age: And so they were to speak as in the Childs name, as if Nature or Charity made them his Representers, in the Judgment of many. (Though others rather think that they were to speak as in their own persons, *e.g.* I dedicate this Child to God, and enter him into the Covenant as obliged by my Consent.) But this sense of *Sponsion* is nothing to the present Case.

They that lay all upon the very Name of a *Surety* as if the word had but one signification, and all *Sureties* properly represented the person of the Principal obliged person, do deal very deceitfully: There are *Sureties* or *Sponsors*, 1. For some Duty, 2. For Debt, 3. For Punishment. 1. It is one thing to undertake that another shall do a Commanded duty: 2. It's another thing to undertake that else I will do it for him: 3. It's another thing to be Surety that he shall pay a Debt, or else I will pay it for him: 4. It's another thing to undertake that he shall suffer a penalty, or else to suffer for him, or make a Valuable Compensation.

1. And it's one kind of Surety that becometh a

second

second party in the bond, and so maketh *himself a debtor*; 2. And its another sort of Surety that *undertaketh only the Debt afterward voluntarily as a Friend*; who may pay it on such Conditions as he and the Creditor think meet, without the Debtors knowledg. Every Novice that will but open *Calvin* may see that *Fidejussor* and *Sponsor* are words of very various signification; and that they seldom or never signifie the *Person Natural* or *Political* (as you call it) of the *Principal*: *Sponsor est qui sponte & non rogatus pro alio promittit, ut Accurs. vel quicunque spondet, maximè pro aliis: Fidejubere est suo periculo fore id, de quo agitur, recipere: Vel, fidem suam pro alio obligare*, He is called *Adpromissor*, and he is *Debtor*, but not the same *person* with the *Principal*, but his promise is *accessoria obligatio, non principalis*. Therefore *Fidejussor sive Intercessor non est conveniendus, nisi prius debitore principali convento: Fidejussores a correis ita differunt, quod hi suo & proprio morbo laborant, illi vero alieno tenentur: Quare fideijussori magis succurrendum censent: Veniâ namque digni sunt qui alienâ tenentur Culpâ, cujusmodi sunt fidejussores pro alieno debito obligati, inquit* Calv.

There must be somewhat more than the bare name ἐγγύος once used of Christ as Mediator of Gods Covenant, or the name of a *Surety* as now used among men, that must go to prove that the Mediator and the several sinners are the same *Legal Persons* in Gods account.

But seeing *Legal-Personality* is but a *Relation* of our *Natural person*, to another *Natural person*, that we may not quarrel and tear the Church when really

we

we differ not 1. Let our agreement be noted. 2. Our difference intelligibly stated.

1. It is granted (not only by *Dr. Tullie*, but others that accurately handle the Controversie,) 1. That Christ and the Believer never were nor are our Natural person; and that no union with him maketh us to be Christ, or God, nor him to be *Peter*, *John* or *Paul*, &c. That we know of no third sort of *Natural person*, (which is neither Jesus, nor *Peter*, *John*, &c.) But composed of both united, which is constituted by our Union. For though it be agreed on, that the same Spirit that is in Christ is (operatively) also in all his Members, and that therefore our *Communion* with him is more than *Relative*, and that from this *Real-Communion*, the name of a *Real-Union* may be used; yet here the *Real-Union* is not *Personal* (as the same Sun quickeneth and illuminateth a Bird and a Frog and a Plant, and yet maketh them not our person:) Therefore he that will say we are *Physically* one with Christ, and not only Relatively; but tell us [*ONE What?*] and make his words Intelligible; and must deny that we are *ONE PERSON*: and that by that time we are not like to be found differing. But remember that while *Physical Communion*, is confessed by all, what *UNION* we shall from thence be said to have (this Foundation being agreed on) is like to prove but a question, *de realitione & nomine*.

2. Yea all the world must acknowledg that the whole Creation is *quoad præsentiam & derivationem* more dependant on God than the fruit is on the *Tree*, or the Tree on the Earth, and that God is the inseperate Cause of our *Being*, *Station*, *and Life*; And

And yet this natural intimateneſs, and influx, and cauſality, maketh not GOD and every Creature abſolutely or perſonally *One*.

3. It is agreed therefore that *Chriſt's Righteouſneſs* is neither *materially* nor *formally*, any *Accident* of our *natural Perſons*; (and an *Accident* it is) *unleſs* it can be reduced to that of *Relation*. 1. The *Habits* of our Perſon, cannot poſſibly be the habits of another inherently. 2. The *actions* of one *cannot* poſſibly be the *actions* of another, as the Agent, unleſs as that other as a *principal Cauſe*, acteth by the other as his *Inſtrument* or ſecond Cauſe. 3. The ſame *fundamentum relationis* inherent in One Perſon, is not inherent in another if it be a perſonal Relation: And ſo the ſame individual Relation that is one Mans, cannot numerically be another Mans, by the ſame ſort of in-being, propriety, or adherence. Two Brothers have a Relation in *kind the ſame*, but not *unmerically*.

4. And it is agreed that God judgeth not falſly, and therefore taketh not Chriſt's Righteouſneſs to be any more or otherwiſe *ours*, than indeed it is; nor imputeth it to us erroneouſly.

5. Yet it is commonly agreed, that *Chriſt's Righteouſneſs* is *OURS* in ſome ſenſe; And ſo far is juſtly *reputed Ours*, or *imputed* to us as being *Ours*.

6. And this ambiguous ſyallable [*OURS*] (enough to ſet another Age of Wranglers into bitter Church-tearing ſtrife, if not hindred by ſome that will call them to explain an ambiguous word) is it that muſt be underſtood to end this Controverſie. *Propriety* is the thing ſignified. 1. In the ſtricteſt ſenſe that is called *Ours*, which inhereth in

us, or that which is *done* by us. 2. In a larger (Moral) ſenſe, that which a Man as the *principal Cauſe*, doth by another as his *Inſtrument*, by authorizing, commanding, perſwading, &c. 3. In a yet larger ſenſe that may be called *OURS*, which a third perſon doth partly *inſtead* of what we ſhould *have done* (*had, or ſuffered*) and partly for our *uſe*, or *benefit*. 4. In a yet larger ſenſe that may be called *OURS*, which another *hath*, or *doth*, or *ſuffereth* for our *Benefit*, (though not in our ſtead) and which will be for our good, (as that which a Friend or Father hath, is his Friends or Childs, and *all things* are *Ours*, whether *Paul*, or &c. and the Godly are owners of the World, in as much as God *will uſe all for* their good).

7. It is therefore a *Relation* which Chriſt's Righteouſneſs hath to us, or we to it, that muſt here be meant by the word [*OURS*]: Which is our *RIGHT* or *Jus*; And that is acknowledged to be no *Jus* or Right to it in the foreſaid denied ſenſe; And it is agreed that *ſome Right* it is. Therefore, to underſtand what it is, the *Titulus ſeu Fundamentum juris* muſt be known.

8. And here it is agreed; 1. That we are before Converſion or Faith related to Chriſt as part of the Redeemed World, of whom it is ſaid, 2 *Cor.* 5. 19. *That God was in Chriſt, reconciling the World to himſelf, not imputing to them their ſins*, &c. 2. That we are after Faith related to Chriſt as his Covenanted People, Subjects, Brethren, Friends, and Political Members; yea, as ſuch that have *Right to*, and *Poſſeſſion of* Real Communion with him by his Spirit: And that we have then Right to *Pardon*, Juſtification, and Adoption, (or have Right

Right to *Impunity* in the promiſed degree, and to the *Spirits Grace*, and the *Love of God*, and *Heavenly Glory*). This Relation to *Chriſt* and this *Right*, to the *Benefits* of his *Righteouſneſs* are agreed on: And conſequently that his *Righteouſneſs* is *OURS*, and ſo may be called, as far as the foreſaid *Relations* and *Rights* import.

II. Now a Relation (as *Ockam* hath fully proved) having no real entity, beſide the *quid abſolutum*, which is the *Subject*, *Fundamentum*, or *Terminus*, he that yet raileth at his Brother as not ſaying enough, or not being herein ſo wiſe as he, and will maintain that yet *Chriſt's Righteouſneſs* is further *OURS*, muſt name the *Fundamentum* of that *Right* or *Propriety*: What more is it that you mean? I think the make-bates have here little probability of fetching any more Fuel to their Fire, or turning Chriſt's Goſpel into an occaſion of ſtrife and mutual enmity, if they will but be driven to a diſtinct explication, and will not make *confuſion* and *ambiguous* words their defence and weapons. If you ſet your quarrelſome Brains on work, and ſtudy as hard as you can for matter of Contention, it will not be eaſie for you to find it, unleſs you will raze out the names of *Popery*, *Socinianiſm*, *Arminianiſm*, or *Solifidianiſm*, Hereſie, *&c.* inſtead of real Difference. But if the *angrieſt* and *lowdeſt* Speakers be in the right, *Bedlam* and *Billingsgate* may be the moſt Orthodox places.

Briefly, 1. The foreſaid Benefits of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, (Habitual, Active and Paſſive) as a Meritorious, Satisfactory, Purchaſing Cauſe, are ours.

2. To say that the Benefits are *Ours*, importeth that the *Causal Righteousness* of Christ is related to *us*, *and the Effects* as *such a Cause:* and so is it self *OURS*, in that sense, that is, so related.

3. And Christ himself is *OURS*, as related to us as our Saviour; the Procurer and Giver of those Benefits. And do you mean any more by [*OURS*]?

If you say that we deny any *Benefits* of Christ's Righteousness which you assert, name what they are. If you say that we deny any true *Fundamentum juris*, or reason of our title, name what that is. If you say that we deny any true Relation to Christ himself, tell us what it is: If you cannot, say that you are agreed.

1. If you say that the Benefit denied by us, is that we are judged by God, as those that (habitually and actively) have perfectly fulfilled the Law of Innocency our selves, though not in our natural Persons, yet by Christ as representing us, and so shall be justified by that Law of Innocency as the Fulfiller of it, we do deny it, and say, That you subvert the Gospel, and the true Benefits which we have by Christ.

2. If you say that we deny that God esteemeth or reputeth us, to be the very Subjects of that Numerical Righteousness, in the Habits, Acts, Passion or Relation, which was in the Person of Christ, or to have *done*, *suffered*, or *merited our selves* in and by him, as the proper Representer of our Persons therein; and so that his Righteousness is thus imputed to us as truly in it self *our own propriety*, we do deny it, and desire you to do so also, lest you deny Christianity.

2. If you blame us for saying, That we had or have no such Relation to Christ, as to our Instrument, or the proper full Representer of each Believers particular Person, by whom we did truly fulfil the Law of Innocency, habitually and actively, and satisfied, merited, &c. We do still say so, and wish you to consider what you say, before you proceed to say the contrary.

But if you come not up to this, where will you find a difference.

Object. 2. *Christ is called The Lord our Righteousness, and he is made Righteousness to us, and we are made the Righteousness of God in him*, 2 Cor. 5. 21, &c. *And by the Obedience of one, many are made Righteous.*

Answ. And are we not all agreed of all this? But can his Righteousness be *Ours* no way but by the foresaid Personation Representating? How prove you that? He is *Our Righteousness*, and his *Obedience maketh us Righteous.*

1. Because the very Law of Innocency which we dishonoured and broke by sin, is perfectly fulfilled and honoured by him, as a Mediator, to repair the injury done by our breaking it.

2. In that he suffered to satisfie Justice for our sin.

3. In that hereby he hath merited of God the Father, all that *Righteousness* which we are truly the Subjects of, whether it be Relative, or Qualitative, or Active; that is, 1. Our Right to Christ in Union to the Spirit, to Impunity, and to Glory; And, 2. The Grace of the Spirit by which we are made Holy, and fulfil the Conditions of the Law

of Grace. We are the *Subjects of these*, and he is the *Minister*, and the *meritorious Cause* of our *Life*, is well called *Our Righteousness*, and by many the *material Cause*, (as our own perfect Obedience would have been) because it is the *Matter* of that Merit.

4. And also Christ's Intercession with the Father, still procureth all this as the Fruit of his Merits.

5. And we are Related as his Members (though not parts of his *Person* as such) to him that thus merited for us.

6. And we have the Spirit from him as our Head.

7. And he is our Advocate, and will justifie us as our Judg.

8. And all this is *God's Righteousness* designed for us, and thus far given us by him.

9. And the perfect Justice and Holiness of God, is thus glorified in us through Christ. And are not all these set together enough to prove, that we justly own all asserted by these Texts? But if you think that you have a better sense of them, you must better prove it, than by a bare naming of the words.

Object. 3. *If Christ's Righteousness be Ours, then we are Righteous by it as Ours; and so God reputeth it but as it is: But it is Ours*; 1. *By our Union with him.* 2. *And by his Gift, and so consequently by God's Imputation.*

Answ. 1. I have told you before that it is confessed to be *Ours*; but that this syllable *OURS* hath many senses; and I have told you in what sense, and

and how far it is *OURS*, and in that ſenſe we are juſtified by it, and it is truly imputed to us, or reputed or reckoned as *OURS*: But not in their ſenſe that claim a ſtrict Propriety in the ſame numerical Habits, Acts, Sufferings, Merits, Satisfaction, which was in Chriſt, or done by him, as if they did become *Subjects* of the *ſame Accidents*; or, as if they did it by an inſtrumental ſecond Cauſe. But it is *OURS*, as being done by a Mediator, inſtead of what we ſhould have done, and as the Meritorious Cauſe of all our Righteouſneſs and Benefits, which are freely given us for the ſake hereof.

2. He that is made Righteouſneſs to us, is alſo made Wiſdom, Sanctification and Redemption to us: but that *ſub genere Cauſæ Efficientis, non autem Cauſæ Conſtitutivæ*: We are the Subjects of the ſame numerical *Wiſdom* and *Holineſs* which is in Chriſt. Plainly the Queſtion is, Whether Chriſt or his Righteouſneſs, Holineſs, Merits, and Satisfaction, be *Our Righteouſneſs Conſtitutively*, or only *Efficiently?* The *Matter* and *Form* of Chriſt's Perſonal Righteouſneſs is *OURS*, as an Efficient Cauſe, but it is neither the neareſt *Matter*, or the *Form* of that Righteouſneſs which is *OURS* as the Subjects of it; that is, It is not a Conſtitutive Cauſe nextly material, or formal of it.

3. If our Union with Chriſt were Perſonal, (making us the ſame Perſon) then doubtleſs the Accidents of his Perſon would be the Accidents of ours, and ſo not only Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, but every Chriſtians would be each of Ours: But that is not ſo. Nor is it ſo given us by him.

Object. 4. *You do seem to suppose that we have none of that kind of Righteousness at all, which consisteth in perfect Obedience and Holiness, but only a Right to Impunity and Life, with an imperfect Inherent Righteousness in our selves: The Papists are forced to confess, that a Righteousness we must have which consisteth in a conformity to the preceptive part of the Law, and not only the Retributive part: But they say, It is in our selves, and we say it is Christ's imputed to us.*

Answ. 1. The Papists (*e. g.* Learned *Vasquer* in *Rom.* 5.) talk so ignorantly of the differences of the Two Covenants, or the Law of Innocency and of Grace, as if they never understood it. And hence they 1. seem to take no notice of the Law of Innocency, or of Nature now commanding our perfect Obedience, but only of the Law of Grace. 2. Therefore they use to call those *Duties* but Perfections; and the Commands that require them, but *Counsels*, where they are not made Conditions of Life: and sins not bringing Damnation, some call Venial, (a name not unfit) and some expound that as properly *no sin*, but analogically. 3. And hence they take little notice, when they treat of Justification, of the *Remitting of Punishment*; but by *remitting Sin*, they usually mean the destroying the *Habits*: As if they forgot all *actual sin past*, or thought that it deserved no Punishment, or needed no Pardon: For a past Act in it self is now nothing, and is capable of no Remission but Forgiveness. 4. Or when they do talk of Guilt of Punishment, they lay so much of the Remedy on Man's *Satisfaction*, as if Christ's Satisfaction and

Merits

Merits had procured no pardon, or at leaſt, of no temporal part of Puniſhment. 5. And hence they ignorantly revile the Proteſtants, as if we denied all *Perſonal Inherent Righteouſneſs*, and truſted only to the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs as juſtifying wicked unconverted Men: The Papiſts therefore ſay not that we are innocent or ſinleſs, (really or imputatively); no not when they dream of *Perfection* and *Supererrogation*, unleſs when they denominate *Sin* and *Perfection* only from the Condition of the Law of Grace, and not that of Innocency.

2. But if any of them do as you ſay, no wonder if they and you contend: If one ſay, We *are Innocent*, or *Sinleſs* in reality, and the *other*, *we are ſo* by *Imputation*, when we are ſo no way at all (but ſinners *really*, and ſo reputed); what Reconciliation is there to be expected, till both lay by their Errour?

Object. 5. *How can God accept him as juſt, who is really and reputedly a Sinner? This diſhonoureth his Holineſs and Juſtice.*

Anſw. Not ſo: Cannot God pardon ſin, upon a valuable Merit and Satisfaction of a Mediator? And though he judg us not *perfect* now, and accept us not as ſuch; yet 1. now he judgeth us Holy, 2. and the Members of a perfect Saviour; 3. and will make us perfect and ſpotleſs, and then ſo judg us, having waſhed us from our ſins in the Blood of the Lamb.

Object. 6. *Thus you make the* Reatus Culpæ, *not pardoned at all, but only the* Reatus Pœnæ.

Anſw.

Answ. 1. If by *Reatus Culpæ* be meant the Relation of a Sinner as he is *Revera Peccator*, and so to be *Reus*, is to be *Revera ipse qui peccavit*; then we must consider what you mean by *Pardon:* For if you mean the *nullifying* of such a *Guilt*, (or *Reality*) it is impossible, because *necessitate existentiæ*, he that hath once sinned, will be still the Person that sinned, while he is a Person, and the Relation of *one that sinned* will cleave to him: It will eternally be a true Proposition, [*Peter* and *Paul* did sin]; But if by *Pardon* you mean, the *pardoning* of all the *penalty* which for that sin is due, (*damni vel sensus*) so *it is pardoned*; and this is indeed the *Reatus pœnæ:* Not only the *Penalty*, but the *Dueness* of that Penalty, or the Obligation to it, is remitted and nullified.

2. Therefore if by *Reatus Culpæ* you mean an *Obligation* to *Punishment for that Fault*, this being indeed the *Reatus pœnæ*, as is said, is done away. So that we are, I think, all agreed *de re*; And *de nomine* you may say that the *Reatus Culpæ* is done away or remitted, or not, in several senses: *In se*, it is not nullified, nor can be: But as *Dueness* of Punishment followeth, that is pardoned.

Object. 7. *You have said, That though we were not personally but seminally in* Adam *when he sinned, yet when we are Persons, we are Persons guilty of his actual sin: And so we must be Persons that are Partakers of Christ's Actual Righteousness, and not only of its Effects, as soon as we are Believers. For Christ being the Second* Adam, *and publick Person, we have our part in his Righteousness, as truly and as much as in* Adam's *sin.*

Answ

Answ. 1. We must first understand how far *Adam*'s sin is ours: And first I have elsewhere proved that our *Covenant-Union and Interest* supposeth our *Natural Union* and *Interest*; and that it is an adding to God's Word and Covenant, to say, That he covenanted that *Adam* should personate each one of his Posterity in God's imputation or account, any further than they were naturally in him; and so that his *innocency or sin* should be reputed theirs, *as far* as if they had been personally the Subjects and Agents. The *Person* of *Peter* never was in *Reality* or *God's Reputation*, the *Person of* Adam. (Nor *Adam*'s Person the Person of *Peter*): But *Peter* being virtually and seminally in *Adam*, when he sinned, his Person is derived from *Adam*'s Person: And so *Peter*'s Guilt is not numerically the same with *Adams*, but the Accident of another Subject, and therefore another Accident, derived with the Person from *Adam* (and from nearer Parents). The *Fundamentum* of that *Relation* (of Guilt) is the *Natural Relation* of the Person to *Adam*, (and so it is *Relatio in Relatione fundata*). The *Fundamentum* of that *natural Relation*, is *Generation*, yea a *series* of Generations from *Adam* to that Person: And *Adam*'s Generation being the Communication of a *Guilty Nature with personality* to his Sons and Daughters, is the *fundamentum* next following his *personal Fault and Guilt* charged on him by the Law: So that here is a long *series* of efficient Causes, bringing down from *Adam's Person and Guilt* a *distinct numerical Person* and *Guilt* of every one of his later Posterity.

2. And it is not the same sort of Guilt, or so plenary, which is on us, for *Adam*'s Act, as was on

on him, but a Guilt Analogical, or of another sort: that is, He was guilty of being the *wilful sinning Person*, and so are not we, but only of being *Persons whose Being is derived by Generation from the wilful sinning Persons*, (besides the guilt of our own inherent pravity): That is, *The Relation is such which our Persons have to* Adam's *Person, as make it just with God to desert us, and to punish us for that and our pravity together.* This is our *Guilt* of Original sin.

3. And this Guilt cometh to us by Natural Propagation, and resultancy from our very Nature so propagated. And now let us consider of our contrary Interest in Christ.

And, 1. Our Persons are not the same as Christ's Person, (nor Christ's as ours) nor ever so judged or accounted of God.

2. Our *Persons* were not naturally, seminally, and virtually in Christ's Person (any further than he is Creator and Cause of all things) as they were in *Adams*.

3. Therefore we derive not Righteousness from him by Generation, but by his voluntary Donation or Contract.

4. As he became not our Natural Parent, so our Persons not *being in Christ* when he obeyed, are not *reputed to have been in him naturally*, or to have obeyed in and by him.

5. If Christ and we are reputed one Person, either he *obeyed* in our *Person*, or we *in his*, or *both*. If he *obeyed* as a *Reputed Sinner* in the Person of each Sinner, his Obedience could not be meritorious, according to the Law of Innocency, which required sinless Perfection; And he being suppo-

fed

ſed to have broken the Law in our Perſons, could not ſo be ſuppoſed to keep it. If we obeyed in his *Perſon*, we obeyed as *Mediators*, or Chriſt's, of which before.

6. But as is oft ſaid, Chriſt our Mediator undertook in a middle Perſon to reconcile God and Man, (not by bringing God erroneouſly to judg that he or we were what we are not, or did what we did not, but) by *being*, *doing*, and *ſuffering* for us, that in *his own Perſon*, which ſhould better anſwer God's Ends and Honour, than if we had done and ſuffered in our Perſons, that hereby he might *merit* a free Gift of *Pardon* and *Life* (with himſelf) to be given by a Law of Grace to believing penitent Accepters. And ſo our Righteouſneſs, as is oft opened, is a Relation reſulting at once from all theſe Cauſes as fundamental to it, *viz.* Chriſt's Meritorious Righteouſneſs, his free Gift thereupon, and our Relation to him as Covenanters or United Believers. And this is agreed on.

Object. 8. *As Chriſt is a Sinner by imputation of our ſin, ſo we are Righteous, by the imputation of his Righteouſneſs. But it is our ſin it ſelf that is imputed to Chriſt: Therefore it is his Righteouſneſs it ſelf that is imputed to us.*

Anſw. 1. Chriſt's Perſon was not the Subject of our perſonal Relative *Guilt*, much leſs of our *Habits* or *Acts*.

2. God did not judg him to have been ſo.

3. Nay, Chriſt had no *Guilt* of the *ſame kind* reckoned to be on him; elſe thoſe unmeet Speeches, uſed raſhly by ſome, would be true, *viz.* That Chriſt was the greateſt Murderer, Adulterer, Idolater, Blaſphe-

Blaſphemer, Thief, *&c.* in all the World, and conſequently more hated of God, (for God muſt needs hate a ſinner as ſuch). To be guilty of ſin as we are, is to be reputed truly to be the Perſon that committed it: But ſo was not Chriſt, and therefore not ſo to be reputed. Chriſt was but the Mediator that undertook to ſuffer for our ſins, that we might be forgiven; and not for his *own* ſin, real or juſtly reputed: Expoſitors commonly ſay that to be [*made ſin for us*], is but to be made [*a Sacrifice for ſin*]. So that Chriſt took upon him neither our *numerical guilt* of ſin it ſelf, nor any of the ſame *ſpecies*; but only our *Reatum Pœnæ*, or *Debt* of *Puniſhment*, or (leſt the Wrangler make a verbal quarrel of it) our *Reatum Culpæ non qua talem & in ſe, ſed quatenus eſt fundamentum Reatus pœnæ:* And ſo his *Righteouſneſs* is ours; not *numerically* the ſame Relation that he was the Subject of made that Relation to us; nor yet a *Righteouſneſs* of the ſame *Species* as Chriſt's is given us at all, (for his was a *Mediators Righteouſneſs*, conſiſting in, 1. *perfect Innocency*; 2. And that in the *Works* of the *Jewiſh Law*, which bind us not; 3. And in doing his *peculiar Works*, as *Miracles*, *Reſurrection*, &c. which were all *His Righteouſneſs* as a conformity to *that Law*, and performance of that *Covenant*, which was made with, and to him *as Mediator*). But his Righteouſneſs is the *Meritorious Cauſe* and *Reaſon* of another Righteouſneſs or Juſtification (diſtinct from his) freely given us by the Father and himſelf by his Covenant. So that here indeed the Similitude much cleareth the Matter; And they that will not blaſpheme Chriſt by making *guilt of ſin it ſelf* in its *formal Relation* to be his own, and ſo

Chriſt

Christ to be *formally* as great a sinner as all the Redeemed set together, and they that will not overthrow the Gospel, by making us formally as Righteous as Christ in kind and measure, must needs be agreed with us in this part of the Controversie.

Object. 9. *When you infer, That if we are reckoned to have perfectly obeyed in and by Christ, we cannot be again bound to obey our selves afterward, nor be guilty of any sin; you must know that it's true, That we cannot be bound to obey to the same ends as Christ did, (which is to redeem us, or to fulfil the Law of Works) But yet we must obey to other ends,* viz. *Ingratitude, and to live to God, and to do good, and other such like.*

Answ. 1. This is very true, That we are not bound to obey to all the same ends that Christ did, as to redeem the World, nor to fulfil the Law of Innocency. But hence it clearly followeth that *Christ obeyed not* in each of our Persons legally, but in the Person of a Mediator, seeing his due Obedience and ours have so different *Ends*, and a different formal Relation, (his being a conformity proximately to the Law, given him as Mediator) that they are not so much as of the same *species*, much less numerically the same.

2. And this fully proveth that we are not reckoned to have perfectly obeyed in and by him: For else we could not be yet obliged to obey, though to other ends than he was: For either this *Obedience* of *Gratitude* is a Duty or not; If not, it is not truly *Obedience*, nor the omission sin: If yea, then *that Duty* was made a Duty by some Law: And if by a Law we are now bound to obey *in gratitude* (or for

for what ends soever) either we do all that we are so bound to do, or not. If we do it (or any of it) then to say that we did it twice, once by Christ, and once by our selves, is to say that we were bound to do it twice, and then Christ did not all that we were bound to, but half: But what Man is he that sinneth not? Therefore seeing it is certain, that no Man doth all that he is bound to do by the Gospel, (in the time and measure of his *Faith*, *Hope*, *Love*, *Fruitfulness*, &c.) it followeth that he is a sinner, and that he is not supposed to have done all that by Christ which he failed in, both because he was bound to do it himself, and because he is a sinner for not doing it.

3. Yea, the Gospel binds us to that which Christ could not do for us, it being a Contradiction. Our great Duties are, 1. To believe in a Saviour. 2. To improve all the parts of his Mediation by a Life of Faith. 3. To repent of our sins. 4. To mortifie sinful Lusts in our selves. 5. To fight by the Spirit against our flesh. 6. To confess our selves sinners. 7. To pray for pardon. 8. To pray for that Grace which we culpably want. 9. To love God for redeeming us. 10. Sacramentally to covenant with Christ, and to receive him and his Gifts; with many such like; which Christ was not capable of doing in and on his own Person for us, though as Mediator he give us Grace to do them, and pray for the pardon of our sins, as in our selves.

4. But the Truth which this Objection intimateth, we all agree in, *viz.* That the Mediator perfectly kept the Law of Innocency, that the keeping of that Law might not be necessary to our Salvation,

on, (and ſo ſuch Righteouſneſs neceſſary in our ſelves) but that we might be pardoned for want of perfect Innocency, and be ſaved upon our ſincere keeping of the Law of Grace, becauſe the Law of Innocency was kept by our Mediator, and thereby the Grace of the New-Covenant merited, and by it Chriſt, Pardon, Spirit and Life, by him freely given to Believers.

Object. 10. *The ſame Perſon may be really a ſinner in himſelf, and yet perfectly innocent in Chriſt, and by imputation.*

Anſw. Remember that you ſuppoſe here the *Perſon* and *Subject* to be the ſame Man: And then that the two contrary Relations of *perfect Innocency*, or *guiltleſneſs*, and *guilt of any*, (yea much ſin) can be conſiſtent in him, is a groſs contradiction. Indeed he may be guilty, and not guilty in ſeveral partial reſpects; but a *perfection* of *guiltleſneſs* excludeth all guilt. But we are guilty of many a ſin after Converſion, and need a Pardon. All that you ſhould ſay is this, *We are ſinners our ſelves, but we have a Mediator that ſinned not, who merited Pardon and Heaven for ſinners.*

2. But if you mean that God reputeth us to be perfectly innocent when we are not, becauſe that Chriſt was ſo, it is to impute Error to God: He reputeth no Man to be otherwiſe than he is: But he doth indeed firſt give, and then impute a Righteouſneſs Evangelical to us, inſtead of perfect Innocency, which ſhall as certainly bring us to Glory; and that is, He giveth us both the Renovation of

his Spirit, (to Evangelical Obedience) and a Right by free gift to Pardon and Glory for the Righteousness of Christ that merited it ; And this thus given us, he reputeth to be an acceptable Righteousness in us.

CHAP. VI.

Animadversions on some of Dr. T. Tullies *Strictures.*

§. 1. I Suppose the Reader desireth not to be wearied with an examination of all Dr. *Tullies* words, which are defective in point of Truth, Justice, Charity, Ingenuity, or Pertinency to the Matter, but to see an answer to those that by appearance of pertinent truth do require it, to disabuse the incautelous Readers ; Though somewhat by the way may be briefly said for my own Vindication. And this Tractate being conciliatory, I think meet here to leave out most of the *words*, and *personal* part of his contendings, and also to leave that which concerneth the *interest of Works* (as they are pleased to call *Man's performance of the Conditions of the Covenant of Grace)* in our Justification, to a fitter place, *viz.* To annex what I think needful to my friendly Conference with Mr. *Christopher Cartwright* on the Subject, which Dr. *Tullies* Assault perswadeth me to publish.

§. 2.

§. 2. *pag.* 71. *Justif. Paulin.* This Learned Doctor saith, [*The Scripture mentioneth no Justification* in foro Dei *at all, but that One, which is Absolution from the Maledictory Sentence of the Law.*

Answ. 1. If this be untrue, it's pity so worthy a Man should unworthily use it against peace and concord. If it be true, I crave his help for the expounding of several Texts.

Exod. 23. 6, 7. *Thou shalt not wrest the Judgment of thy Poor in his Cause: Keep thee far from a false Matter, and the Innocent and Righteous slay thou not; for I will not justifie the wicked*]. Is the meaning only, I will not absolve the wicked from the Maledictory Sentence of the Law (of Innocency)? Or is it not rather, [I will not misjudg the wicked to be just, nor allow his wickedness, nor yet allow thee so to do, nor leave thee unpunished for thy unrighteous judgment, but will condemn thee if thou condemn the Just].

Job 25. 4. *How then can Man be justified with God?* or, *How can he be clean that is born of a Woman?* Is the sense, [*How can Man be absolved from the Maledictory Sentence of the Law?*] Or rather, [How can he be maintained Innocent?]

Psal. 143. 2. *In thy sight shall no Man living be justified.* Is the sense, [*No Man living shall be absolved from the Maledictory sentence of the Law?* Then we are all lost for ever: Or rather no Man shall be found and maintained Innocent, and judged *one that deserved not punishment*]; (Therefore we are not judged perfect fulfillers of that Law by another or our selves).

Object. *But this is for us and against you: for it denyeth that there is any such Justification.*

Answ. Is our Controversie *de re*, or only *de nomine*, of the sense of the word Justifie? If *de re*, then his meaning is to maintain, That God never doth judg a Believer to be a Believer, or a Godly Man to be Godly, or a performer of the Condition of Pardon and Life to have performed it, nor will justifie any believing Saint against the false Accusations, that he is an Infidel, a wicked ungodly Man, and an Hypocrite, (or else he writeth against those that he understood not). But if the Question be (as it must be) *de nomine*, whether the word *Justifie* have any sense besides that which he appropriateth to it, then a Proposition that denieth the *Existentiam rei*, may confute his denyal of any other sense of *the word*.

So *Isa.* 43. 9, 26. *Let them bring forth their Witnesses that they may justified: Declare thou that thou mayest be justified*; that is, proved Innocent.

But I hope he will hear and reverence the Son; Matth. 12. 37. *By thy words thou shalt be Justified, and by thy words thou shalt be Condemned*] (speaking of Gods Judgment) which I think meaneth (*de re & nomine*) *Thy Righteous or unrighteous words* shall be a part of the Cause of the day, or Matter, for or according to which, thou shalt be judged obedient or disobedient to the Law of Grace, and so far just or unjust, and accordingly sentenced to Heaven or Hell, as is described *Matth.* 25. But it seems this Learned Doctor understands it only, *By thy words thou shalt be absolved* from the Maledictory Sentence of the Law, and by thy words contrarily condemned.

Luk. 18. 14. The Publican [*went down to his House justified rather than the other*]; I think not only

only [from the *Maledictory Sentence of the Law* of *Innocency*] but [*by God approved a sincere Penitent*], and so a fit Subject of the other part of Justification.

Acts 13. 30. is the Text that speaketh most in the sense he mentioneth; And yet I think it includeth more, *viz.* *By Christ*, 1. *we are not* only absolved from that Condemnation due for our sins; 2. but also we are by his repealing or ending of the *Mosaick Law* justified against the Charge of Guilt for our not observing it; and 3. *Augustine* would add, That we are by Christ's Spirit and Grace made just (that is, sincerely Godly) by the destruction of those inherent and adherent sins, which the *Law* of *Moses* could not mortifie and save us from, but the Spirit doth.

Rom. 2. 13. *Not the Hearers of the Law are just before God, but the Doers of the Law shall be justified*]. Is it only, *The Doers shall be Absolved from the Maledictory Sentence, &c?* Or first and chiefly, *They shall be judged well-doers, so far as they do well*, and so approved and justified, so far as they do keep the Law? (which because no Man doth perfectly, and the Law of Innocency requireth Perfection, none can be justified absolutely, or to Salvation by it).

Object. *The meaning is*, (say some) *The Doers of the Law should be justified by it*; were there any such.

Answ. That's true, of absolute Justification unto Life: But that this is not all the sense of the Text, the two next Verses shew, where the Gentiles are pronounced partakers of some of that which he meaneth inclusively in doing to Justification: There-

fore it must include that their Actions and Persons are so *far justified*, (more or less) as they are *Doers* of the Law, as being so far actively just.

Rom. 8. 30. *Whom he justified, them he also glorified*; And 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. *Ye are justified in the Name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.* Many Protestants, and among them *Beza* himself, expound (in the Papists and *Austins* sense of Justification) as including Sanctification also, as well as Absolution from the Curse: And so Arch Bishop *Usher* told me he understood them. As also *Tit.* 3. 7. *That being justified freely by his Grace.*

And many think so of *Rom.* 4. 5. he [*justifieth* the *Ungodly*] say they, by Converting, Pardoning, and Accepting them in Christ to Life.

And *Rom.* 8. 33. *Who shall condemn? it is* God that *justifieth*, seemeth to me more than barely to say, God *absolveth us from the Curse*, because it is set against *Man's Condemnation*, (who reproached, slandered and persecuted the Christians as evil Doers, as they did Christ, to whom they were predestinated to be conformed). And so must mean, *God will not only absolve us from his Curse*, but also justifie our Innocency against all the false Accusations of our Enemies.

And it seemeth to be spoken by the Apostle, with respect to *Isa.* 50. 8. *He is near that justifieth me, who will contend with me?* Which my reverence to this Learned Man sufficeth not to make me believe, is taken only in his sense of Absolution.

Rev. 22. 11. *He that is Righteous, let him be justified still*, (δικαιωθήτω) which not only our Translaters, but almost all Expositors take as inclusive

clusive of Inherent Righteousness, if not principally speaking of it.

To speak freely, I remember not one Text of Scripture that useth the word [*Justifie*] in this Doctor's sense; that is, *Only for the said absolution from the Curse of the Law:* For all those other Texts that speak for Justification by Christ's Grace, and Faith, *and not by the Works of the Law*, (as *Rom.* 3. 20, 24, 28, 30. and 4. 2, 5, 25. & 5. 1, 9, 16, 18. 1 *Cor.* 4. 4. *Gal.* 2. 16, 17. & 3. 8, 11, 24. & 5. 4, *&c.*) do all seem to me to mean, not only that [we are *absolved from the Maledictory Sentence of the Law*], but also that we are first *made*, and then accounted Persons first meet for Absolution, and next meet for God's Acceptance of us as just, and as Heirs of Life Eternal, and meet for the great *Reward in Heaven:* For when the Apostle denieth *Justification* by *Works*; it is not credible that he meaneth only, that [*By the Works of the Law no Man is absolved from the Curse of the Law*]; But also, *No Man by the Works of the Law*, is before God taken for a Performer of the necessary Condition of Absolution and Salvation, nor fit for his Acceptance, and for the Heavenly Reward.

Answ. 2. But let the Reader here note, that the Doctor supposeth *James* to mean, that [*By Works a Man is absolved from the Maledictory Sentence of the Law, and not by Faith only*]. For that *James* speaks of Justification *in foro Dei* is past all doubt: And who would have thought that the Doctor had granted this of the Text of *James?* But mistakes seldom agree among themselves.

Answ. 3. And would not any Man have thought

that this Author had pleaded for such an Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, as justifieth not only from the Maledictory Sentence of the Law, but also from the very guilt of sin as sin, we being reputed, (not only pardoned sinners, but) perfect fulfillers of the Law by Christ, and so that we are in Christ conform to the *Fac hoc* or preceptive part commanding Innocency? Who would have thought but this was his drift? If it be not, all his angry Opposition to me, is upon a mistake so foul, as reverence forbids me to name with its proper Epithets: If it be, how can the same Man hold, That we are justified as in Christ, conform *to the Precept of perfect Innocency?* And yet that *The Scripture mentioneth no Justification at all*, in foro Dei, *besides that one, which is Absolution from the Maledictory Sentence of the Law.* But still mistakes have discord with themselves.

Answ. 4. It is the judgment indeed of Mr. *Gataker*, *Wotton*, *Piscator*, *Paræus*, *Ursine*, *Wendeline*, and abundance other excellent Divines, that as sins of omission are truly sin, and *pœna damni*, or privations truly punishment; so for a sinner for his sin to be denied God's Love and Favour, Grace and Glory, is to be punished; and to be pardoned, is to have this privative punishment remitted as well as the rest; and so that Justification containeth our Right to Glory, as it is the bare forgiveness of the penalty of sin; because Death and Life, Darkness and Light are such Contraries, as that one is but the privation of the other: But this Learned Doctor seemeth to be of the commoner Opinion, that the Remission of Sin is but one part of our Justification, and that by Imputation of perfect Holiness

Holineſs and Obedience we muſt have another part, which is our *Right to the Reward*; (and I think a little Explication would end that difference). But doth he here then agree with himſelf? And to contradict the common way of thoſe with whom he joyneth? Do they not hold that Juſtification is more than an *Abſolution from the Maledictory Sentence of the Law?*

Anſw. 5. But indeed his very Deſcription by *Abſolution* is utterly ambiguous: 1. Abſolution is either by *Actual Pardon*, by the Law or Covenant of Grace; which giveth us our *Right* to *Impunity*: 2. Or by *Sentence* of the Judg, who publickly *decideth* our Caſe, and declareth our Right determinatively: Or by execution of that Sentence in actual delivering us from penalty; And who knoweth which of theſe he meaneth? This is but confuſion, to deſcribe by an unexplained equivocal word.

And who knoweth what Law he meaneth, whoſe *Maledictory Sentence* Juſtification abſolveth us from? Doth he think that the Law of Innocency, and of *Moſes*, and the Law of Grace are all one, which Scripture ſo frequently diſtinguiſheth? Or that each of them hath not its *Malediction?* If he deny this, I refer him to my full proof of it, to Mr. *Cartwright* and elſewhere. If not, we ſhould know whether he mean all, or which.

3. And what he meaneth by the Sentence of the Law is uncertain: Whether it be the Laws *Commination*, as obliging us to puniſhment, which is not a *Sentence* in the uſual proper ſenſe, but only a *virtual Sentence*, that is, the *Norma Judicis*; or whether he mean the *Sentence of God as Judg*, according to the *Law:* which is not the Sentence of the Law pro-

properly, but of the Judg: It's more intelligible speaking, and distinct, that must edifie us, and end those Controversies which ambiguities and confusion bred and feed.

Answ. 6. But which-ever he meaneth, most certainly it is not true that the Scripture mentioneth no other Justification in *foro Dei*. For many of the fore-cited Texts tell us, that it oft mentioneth a Justification, which is no Absolution from the Maledictory Sentence, (neither of the Law of Innocency, of *Moses*, or of Grace) but a Justification of a Man's innocency in *tantum*, or *quoad Causam hanc particularem*, *Viz.*

1. Sometimes a Justifying the Righteous Man against the slanders of the World, or of his Enemies.

2. Sometimes a justifying a Man in some one action, as having dealt faithfully therein.

3. Sometimes a judging a Man to be a faithful Godly Man, that performeth the Conditions of Life in the Law of Grace made necessary to God's Acceptance.

4. Sometimes for making a Man such, or for making him yet more inherently just, or continuing him so.

5. Sometimes for Justification by the Apology of an Advocate, (which is not *Absolution*).

6. Sometimes for Justification by *Witness*.

7. And sometimes, perhaps, by *Evidence*. As appeareth, *Isa* 50. 8. *Rom.* 8. 33. (and so God himself is said to be justified, *Psal.* 51. 4. *Rom.* 3. 4. and Christ, 1 *Tim.* 3. 16.) 1 King. 8. 32. *Hear thou in Heaven, and do, and judg thy Servants, condemning the Wicked to bring his way upon his Head; and*

and justifying the Righteous, to give him according to his Righteousness, (where the *Sentence* is passed by the Act of Execution). Is this absolving him from the Curse of the Law? So 1 *Chron.* 6. 23. so *Mat.* 12. 37. & *Jam.* 2. 21, 24, 25. where Justification by our *Words* and by *Works* is asserted; and many other Texts so speak: Frequently to Justifie, is to *maintain* one, or *prove him* to be just. It's strange that any Divine should find but one sort or sense of Justification before God mentioned in the Scriptures.

I would give here to the Reader, a help for some excuse of the Author, *viz.* that by [*præter unam illam quæ est Absolutio*] he might mean, which is *partly Absolution*, and *partly Acceptation*, as of a fulfiller of the Precept of Perfection by Christ, and partly Right to the Reward, all three making up the whole; but that I must not teach him how to speak his own mind, or think that he knew not how to utter it; And specially, because the Instances here prove that even so it is very far from Truth, had he so spoken.

Answ. 7. But what if the word [*Justification*] had been found only as he affirmed? If *Justice*, (Righteousness) and *Just*, be otherwise used, that's all one in the sense, and almost in the word; seeing it is confessed, that *to Justifie*, is, 1. To *make Just*; 2. Or to *esteem Just*; 3. Or *sentence Just*; 4. Or to prove Just, and defend as Just; 5. Or to *use* as Just by execution. And therefore in so many senses as a Man is called *Just* in Scripture, he is inclusively, or by connotation, said to be *Justified*, and *Justifiable*, and *Justificandus*. And I desire no more of the Impartial Reader, but to

turn

turn to his *Concordances*, and peruſe all the Texts where the words [Juſt, Juſtice, Juſtly, Righteous, Righteouſneſs, Righteouſly] are uſed; and if he find not that they are many ſcore, if not hundred times uſed, for that Righteouſneſs which is the Perſons Relation reſulting from ſome Acts or Habits of his own, (as the Subject or Agent) and otherwiſe than according to his ſolitary ſenſe here, let him then believe this Author.

§. 3. But he is as unhappy in his Proofs, as in his ſingular untrue Aſſertion: "[Rom. 8. 2, 4. "*The Law of the Spirit of Life, hath freed us from* "*the Law of Sin and of Death.* Gal. 3. 13. *God* "*ſent his Son, that the Righteouſneſs of the Law* "*might be fulfilled in us; Chriſt hath redeemed us* "*from the Curſe of the Law*; and many more ſuch: Here is no mention of any but *one Legal Juſtification*].

Anſw. 1. Reader, do you believe that theſe two Texts are a perfect Enumeration. And that if theſe mention but one ſenſe or ſort of Juſtification, that it will follow that no more is mentioned in Scripture: Or if many hundred other Texts have the ſame ſenſe?

2. Nay, he hath choſen only theſe Texts where the word [*Juſtification*] or [*Juſtifie*] is not at all found. By which I may ſuppoſe that he intendeth the Controverſie here *de re*, and not *de nomine*. And is that ſo? Can any Man that ever conſiderately opened the Bible, believe that *de re* no ſuch Thing is mentioned in Scripture. 1. As making a Man a believing Godly Man. 2. Or as performing the Conditions of Life required of us in the Covenant of Grace. 3. Nor eſteeming a Man

Man such. 4. Nor defending or proving him to be such. 5. Nor judging him such decisively. 6. Nor using him as such. 7. Nor as justifying a Man so far as he is Innocent and Just against all false Accusation of Satan or the World.

3. The first Text cited by him, *Rom.* 8.24. downright contradicts him: Not only *Augustine*, but divers Protestant Expositors suppose, that by the *Law of the Spirit of Life* is meant, either the *quickning Spirit it self* given to us that are in Christ, or the Gospel, as it *giveth that Spirit into us*; And that by *delivering* us from the *Law of Sin*, is meant either from that *sin which is* as a *Law within us*, or *Moses Law*, as it forbiddeth and commandeth all its peculiarities, and so maketh *doing* or *not doing* them sin; and as it declareth sin, yea, and accidentally irritateth it: Yea, that by the Law of Death is meant, not only that Law we are cursed by, and so guilty, but chiefly that Law, as it is said *Rom.* 7. to *kill Paul*, and to occasion the abounding of sin, and the Life of it: And that by [*the fulfilling of the Law in us, that walk not after the Flesh, but after the Spirit*], is meant [that by the Spirit and Grace of Christ, Christians do fulfil the Law, as it requireth sincere Holiness, Sobriety and Righteousness, which God accepteth for Christ's sake; which the Law of *Moses*, without Christ's Spirit, enabled no Man to fulfil]. Not to weary the Reader with citing Expositors, I now only desire him to peruse, *Ludov. de Dieu* on the Text.

And it is certain, that the Law that *Paul* there speaketh of, was *Moses* Law: And that he is proving all along, that the observation of it was not necessary to the Gentiles, to their *performance*, or Justi-

Justification and Salvation, (*necessitate præcepti vel medii*); (for it would not justifie the Jews themselves). And sure, 1. all his meaning is not, [The Law will not absolve Men from the sense of the Law]. But also *its Works* will give no one the just title of a Righteous Man, accepted of God, and saved by him, as judging between the Righteous and the wicked: (as Christ saith, *Matth.* 25. *The Righteous shall go into Everlasting Life*, &c.) 2. And if it were only the *Maledictory Sentence* of *Moses Law*, as such, that *Paul* speaketh of Absolution from, as our only Justification, then none but Jews and Proselites who were under that Law, could have the Justification by Faith which he mentioneth; for it curseth none else: For what-ever the Law saith, it saith to them that are under the Law: The rest of the World were only under the Law of lapsed Nature, (the relicts of *Adam*'s Law of Innocency) and the Curse for *Adam*'s first Violation; and the Law of Grace made to *Adam* and *Noah*, and after perfected fullier by Christ in its second Edition.

2. His other Text [*Christ redeemed us from the Curse of the Law*] proveth indeed that all Believers are redeemed from the Curse of the first Law of Innocency, and the Jews from the Curse of *Moses Law* (which is it that is *directly* meant): But what's that to prove that these words speak the whole and the *only Justification?* and that the Scripture mentioneth no other?

§. 4. He addeth, [*Lex est quæ prohibet; Lex quæ pœnam decernit; Lex quæ irrogat: Peccatum est transgressio Legis: Pœna effectus istius trangressionis; Justificatio denique absolutio ab ista pœna: Itaque*

cum

cum Lex nisi præstita neminem Justificat, & præstitam omnes in Christo agnoscunt, aut Legalis erit omnis Justificatio coram Deo, aut omnino nulla].

Answ. 1. But doth he know but *one sort of Law* of God? Hath every Man incurred the Curse by *Moses* Law that did by *Adams*? Or every Man fallen under the peremptory irreversible condemnation which the Law of Grace passeth on them that never believe and repent? Doth this Law, [*He that believeth not shall be damned*] damn Believers? One Law condemneth all that are not Innocent. Another supposeth them under that defect, and condemneth peremptorily (not every Sinner) but the Wicked and Unbelievers.

2. Again here he saith, [*Justification is Absolution from that Penalty*]. But is a Man absolved (properly) from that which he was never guilty of? Indeed if he take *Absolution* so loosly as to signifie, the justifying a Man against a false Accusation, and pronouncing him *Not-Guilty*; So all the Angels in Heaven may possibly be capable of Absolution: Justification is ordinarily so used, but Absolution seldom by Divines. And his words shew that this is not his sense, if I understand them. But if we are reputed perfect fulfillers of the Law of Innocency by Christ, and yet Justification is our Absolution from the Curse, then no Man is justified that is Righteous by that Imputation.

3. And how unable is my weak Understanding, to make his words at peace with themselves? The same Man in the next lines saith, [*Lex nisi præstita neminem justificat:* and all *Justification before God must be legal or none*]; so that no Man is justified but as reputed Innocent, or a performer of the Law:

And

And yet *Justification* is our Absolution from the Punishment and Malediction of the Law; As if he said, No Man is justified but by the pardon of that sin which he is reputed never to have had, and Absolution from that Curse and Punishment which he is reputed never to have deserved or been under. Are these things reconcileable? But if really he take *Absolution* for justifying or acquitting from a false Accusation, and so to be absolved from the Malediction of the Law, is to be reputed one that never deserved it, or was under it, then it's as much as to say, that there is no pardon of sin, or that no Man that is pardoned, or reputed to need a Pardon, is justified.

4. All this and such Speeches would perswade the Reader that this Learned Disputer thinketh that I took and use the word [Legal] generally as of that which is related to any Law *in genere*, and so take *Evangelical* contrarily for that which is related to no Law: whereas I over and over tell him, that (speaking in the usual Language that I may be understood) I take [Legal] *specially* (and not generally) for that Righteousness which is related to the *Law of Works* or *Innocency*, (not as if we had indeed such a Righteousness as that Law will justifie us for; But a *pro-Legal-Righteousness*, one *instead of it*, *in* and *by* our perfect Saviour, which shall effectually save us from that Laws condemnation): And that by [*Evangelical Righteousness*], I mean, that which is related to the *Law of Grace*, as the Rule of *Judgment*, upon the just pleading whereof that Law will not condemn but justifie us. If he knew this to be my meaning, in my weak judgment, he should not have written either as if he

did

did not, or as if he would perſwade his Rsaders to the contrary: For Truth is moſt congruouſly defended by Truth: But if he *knew it not*, I deſpair of becoming intelligible to him, by any thing that I can write, and I ſhall expect that this Reply be wholly loſt to him and worſe.

5. His [*Lex niſi præſtita neminem juſtificat*] is true; and therefore no Man is juſtified by the Law, But his next words [*& præſtitam omnes in Chriſto agnoſcunt*] ſeemeth to mean that [*It was performed by us in Chriſt*]; Or that [*It juſtifieth us, becauſe performed perfectly by Chriſt as ſuch*]: Which both are the things that we moſt confidently deny. It was not Phyſically, or Morally, or Politically, or Legally, or Reputatively, (take which word you will) *fulfilled by us in Chriſt*: it doth not juſtifie us, becauſe it was fulfilled by Chriſt, (*as ſuch*, or immediately, and *eo nomine*). It juſtified *Chriſt*, becauſe he fulfilled it; and ſo their Law doth all the perfect Angels. But we did not perſonally fulfil it in Chriſt; it never allowed *vicarium obedientiæ* to fulfil it by our *ſelves* or another: Therefore anothers *Obedience*, merely as ſuch, (even a Mediators) is not our Obedience or Juſtification: But that Obedience juſtifieth us, as given us only in or to the effecting of our Perſonal Righteouſneſs, which conſiſteth in our right to Impunity, and to God's Favour and Life, freely given for Chriſt's Merits ſake, and in our performance of the Conditions of the Law of Grace, or that free Gift, which is therefore not a co-ordinate but a ſub-ordinate Righteouſneſs (and Juſtification) to qualifie us for the former. This is ſo plain and neceſſary, that if (in ſenſe) it be not underſtood by all that are admitted to the Sa-

cramental Communion, (excepting Verbal Controversies or Difficulties) I doubt we are too lax in our admissions.

§. 5. Next he tel's us of a *threefold respect of Justification* : 1. *Ex parte principii.* 2. *Termini.* 3. *Medii* : (I find my self uncapeable of *teaching him*, that is a Teacher of such as I, and therefore presume not to tell him how to distinguish more congruously, plainly, and properly, as to the terms). And *as to the Principle or Fountain whence it floweth*, that is, *Evangelical Grace in Christ*, he saith, *It is thus necessary, that in our lapsed State all Justification be Evangelical*].

Answ. Who would desire a *sharper* or a *softer*, a more *dissenting* or a more *consenting* Adversary ? Very good : If then I mean it *ex parte principii*, I offend him not by asserting Evangelical Righteousness : The Controversie then will be only *de nomine*, whether it be congruous thus to call it. And really are his *Names* and *Words* put into our Creed, and become so necessary as to be worthy of all the stress that he layeth on them, and the calling up the Christian World to arrive by their Zeal against our Phrase ? Must the Church be awakened to rise up against all those that will say with Christ, [*By thy words thou shalt be justified*]. And with *James*, [*By Works a Man is justified, and not by Faith only*], and [*we are judged by the Law of Liberty*] ; and as Christ, *Joh.* 5. 22. [*The Father judgeth no Man, but hath committed all Judgment to the Son*] ; and that shall recite the 25*th* Chapter of *Matthew*.

Even now he said at once, [*There is no Justification* in foro Dei, *but Absolution*, &c. *The Law of the Spirit of Life hath freed us*, &c. *Here is no men-*

mention of any Justification but Legal]. And now [*All our Justification* ex parte principii, is *only Evangelical*]. So then *no Text* talks of *Evangelical Justification*, or of Justification *ex parte principii:* And *Absolution* which defineth it, is named *ex parte principii.* And yet all *Justification* is *Evangelical.* Is this mode of Teaching worthy a Defence by a Theological War?

2. But Reader, Why may not I denominate Justification *ex parte principii? Righteousness* is formally a Relation: To justifie constitutively, is to *make Righteous.* To be Justified, (or Justification *in sensu passivo*) is to be made *Righteous*; And *in foro*, to be *judged Righteous:* And what meaneth he by *Principium* as to a Relation, but that which other Men call the *Fundamentum*, which is *loco Efficientis*, or a remote efficient? And whence can a Relation be more fitly named, than from the *fundamentum*, whence it hath its formal being? Reader, bear with my Error, or correct it, if I mistake. I think that as our *Righteousness* is not all of one sort, no more is the *fundamentum:* 1. I think I have no Righteousness, whose immediate *fundamentum* is my sinless Innocency, or fulfilling the Law of Works or Innocency, by my self or another: and so I have no *fundamentum* of such. 2. I hope I have a Righteousness consisting in my personal *Right* to *Impunity* and *Life*; and that *Jus* or *Right* is mine by the *Title* of *free Condonation* and *Donation* by the Gospel-Covenant or Grant: And so that Grant or Gospel is the *fundamentum* of it: But the Merits of Christ's Righteousness purchased that Gift, and so those Merits are the remote *fundamentum* or efficient: And thus my Justification,

by the Doctor's confession, is Evangelical. 3. I must perish if I have not also a subordinate personal Righteousness, consisting in my performance of those Conditions on which the New-Covenant giveth the former. And the *fundamentum* of this Righteousness is the Reality of that performance, as related to the Irrogation, Imposition, or Tenor of the Covenant, making this the Condition. This is my Heresie, if I be heretical; and be it right or wrong, I will make it intelligible, and not by saying and unsaying, involve all in confusion.

§. 6. He addeth, [*Ex parte Termini Legalis est, quia terminatur in satisfactione, Legi præstandâ: Liberavit me à Lege mortis, &c. And hence,* he saith, *the denomination is properly taken.*

Answ. 1. The Reader here seeth that all this Zeal is exercised in a *Game at Words*, or *Logical Notions*; and the Church must be called for the umpirage, to stand by in Arms to judg that he hath won the Day: What if the *denomination be properly to be taken from* the *Terminus?* Is it as dangerous as you frightfully pretend to take it *aliunde?* 2. But stay a little: Before we come to this, we must crave help to understand what he talketh of: Is it, 1. *Justificatio, Justificans (active-sumpta)?* Or, 2. *Justificatio Justificati (passive)?* 3. Or *Justitia?*

1. The first is *Actio*, and the *Terminus* of that Action is two-fold. 1. The Object or Patient (a believing Sinner). 2. The Effect, *Justificatio passivè*, neither of these is *the Law*, or its *Maledictio-on.* But which of these is it that we must needs name it from?

2. The *passive* or *effective* Justification is in respect of the Subjects Reception called *Passio:* In respect

respect of the form received, it is as various as I before mentioned.

1. The Effect of the Donative Justification of the Law of Grace, is *Justitia data*; a Relation (oft described).

2. The Effect of the Spirits giving us *Inherent Righteousness*, is a *Quality given*, *Acts excited*, and a Relation thence resulting.

3. The Effect of *Justification per Sententiam Judicis*, is immediately a Relation, *Jus Judicatum.*

4. The Effect of an Advocates Justification, is *Justitia & persona ut defensa seu vindicata.*

5. The Effect of *Executive Justification*, is Actual Impunity or Liberation. And are all these one *Terminus*, or hence one name then? These are the *Termini* of *Justificatio Justificantis, ut Actionis*; and nothing of this nature can be plainer, than that, 1. Remission of sin (passively taken) the *Reatus* or *Obligatio ad pœnam*, (the first *ad quem*, and the second *à quo*) are both the immediate *Termini* of our Act of Justification. 2. That the *Terminus Justitiæ*, as it is the formal Relation of a Justified Person, as such, is the Law as *Norma Actionum*, as to Righteous Actions, and the Law or Covenant, as making the Condition of Life, as to those Actions, *sub ratione Conditionis & Tituli.* And the Promissory and Minatory part of the Law, as *Justitia* is *Jus præmii, & impunitatis.* First, The Actions, and then the Person are Just in Relation to the Law or Covenant, by which their Actions and they are to be judged. But the remoter *Terminus* is the *malum à quo*, and the *bonum ad quod.* And as *à quo*, it is not only the *evil* denounced, but also the

Reatus, or Obligation to it, and the efficacious Act of the Law thus curſing, and the *Accuſation* of the Actor or Accuſer, (real or poſſible) that is ſuch a *terminus*.

II. But when he ſaith, *Ex parte Termini Legalis eſt*, either ſtill he taketh *legal generally*, as comprehending the Law of *Innocency*, of *Works*, and of *Grace*, or not. If he do, I muſt hope he is more *intelligent* and *juſt*, than to inſinuate to his Reader, that I ever mention an *Evangelical Juſtification* that is not ſo legal, as to be denominated from the Law of Grace, as diſtinct from that of Works: If not, he was indebted to his intelligent Reader for ſome proof, that no Man is juſtified againſt this falſe Accuſation; [Thou art by the Law of Grace the Heir of a far ſorer puniſhment, for deſpiſing the Remedy, and not performing the Conditions of Pardon and Life. And alſo for this thou haſt no right to Chriſt, and the Gifts of his Covenant of Grace]. But no ſuch proof is found in his Writings, nor can be given.

III. But his [*Quia Terminatur in ſatisfactione Legi præſtanda*]. I confeſs it is a Sentence not very intelligible or edifying to me. 1. *Satisfactio proprie & ſtricte ſic dicta differt à ſolutione ejuſdem quod ſit, ſolutio æquivalentis alias indebite:* Which of theſe he meaneth, Satisfaction thus ſtrictly taken, or *ſolutio ejuſdem*, I know not: Nor know what it is that he meaneth by *Legi præſtandâ:* Indeed *ſolutio ejuſdem* is *Legi præſtanda*, but not *præſtita* by us (perſonally or by another): For we neither kept the Law, nor bare the full Penalty; And

the

the Law mentioned no *Vicarium Obedientiæ aut pœnæ*; Christ *performed the Law*, as it obliged himself as Mediator, and as a Subject, but not as *it obliged us*; for it obliged us to *Personal performance only*: And Christ by bearing that Punishment (in some respects) which we deserved, satisfied the *Law-giver*, (who had power to take a Commutation) but not *the Law*: unless speaking improperly you will say that the *Law is satisfied*, when the remote ends of the Law-giver and Law are obtained. For the Law hath but one fixed sense, and may be it self changed, but changeth not it self, nor accepteth a *tantundem*: And Christ's suffering for us, was a *fulfilling* of the Law, which peculiarly *bound him* to suffer, and not a Satisfaction *loco solutionis ejusdem*: And it was no *fulfilling* the *Penal part* of the *Law* as it bound *us* to suffer: For so it bound none but us; so that the *Law* as *binding* us to *Duty* or *Suffering*, was neither *fulfilled*, nor strictly *satisfied* by Christ; but the *Law-giver* satisfied, and the remote ends of the Law attained, by Christ's perfect fulfilling all that Law which bound himself as Mediator.

Now whether he mean the Law as binding us to *Duty*, or to *Punishment*, or both, and what by *satisfaction* I am not sure: But as far as I can make sense of it, it seeneth to mean, that *Pœna* is *satisfactio loco obedientiæ*, and that Punishment being our Due, this was *satisfactio Legi præstandâ*, (for he saith not *Præstita*). But then he must judge that we are justified only from the *penal Obligation* of the Law, and not from the *preceptive Obligation* to perfect Obedience. And this will not stand with the scope of other Passages, where he endureth not

my Opinion, that we are not *justified* by the *fac hoc*, the Precept as fulfilled, or from the *Reatus Culpæ in se*, but by Christ's whole Righteousness from the *Reatus ut ad pœnam*.

2. But if this be his sense, he meaneth then that it is only the *Terminus à quo*, that *Justification* is properly denominated from. And why so? 1. As *Justitia* and *Justificatio passive sumpta, vel ut effectus*, is *Relatio*, it hath necessarily no *Terminus à quo*; And certainly is *in specie*, to be rather denominated from its own proper *Terminus ad quem*. And as *Justification* is taken for the Justifiers *Action*; why is it not as well to be denominated from the *Terminus ad quem*, as *à quo? Justificatio efficiens sic dicitur, quia Justum facit: Justificatio apologetica, quia Justum vindicat vel probat. Justificatio per sententiam, quia Justum aliquem esse Judicat: Justificatio executiva, quia ut Justum eum tractat.*

But if we must needs denominate from the *Terminus à quo*, how strange is it that he should know but of *one* sense of *Justification?*

3. But yet perhaps he meaneth, [*In satisfactione Legi præstitâ*, though he say *præstandâ*, and so denominateth from the *Terminus à quo:* But if so, 1. Then it cannot be true: For *satisfacere & Justificare* are not the same thing, nor is *Justifying giving Satisfaction*; nor were we justified when Christ had satisfied, but long after: Nor are we justified *eo nomine*, because Christ satisfied, (that is, immediately) but because he gave us that *Jus ad impunitatem & vitam & spiritum sanctum*, which is the *Fruit* of his Satisfaction. 2. And as is said, if it be only *in satisfactione*, then it is not in that *Obedience which fulfileth* the preceptive part as it bound

bound us: for to satisfie for not fulfilling, is not to fulfil it. 3. And then no Man is justified, for no Man hath satisfied either the Preceptive or Penal Obligation of the Law, by himself or another: But Christ hath satisfied the Law-giver by Merit and Sacrifice for sin.

His *Liberavit nos à Lege Mortis*, I before shewed impertinent to his use, Is *Liberare & Justificare*, or *Satisfacere* all one? And is *à Lege Mortis*, either from all the Obligation to Obedience, or from the sole malediction? There be other Acts of *Liberation* besides *Satisfaction*: For it is [*The Law of the Spirit of Life*] that doth it: And we are freed both from the *power* of *indwelling-sin*, (called a Law) and from the Mosaical Yoak, and from the Impossible Conditions of the Law of Innocency, though not from its bare Obligation to future Duty.

§. 7. He addeth a Third, *Ex parte Medii, quod est Justitia Christi Legalis nobis per fidem Imputata: Omnem itaque Justificationem proprie Legalem esse constat.*

Answ. 1. When I read that he will have but one sense or sort of Justification, will yet have the Denomination to be *ex termino*, and so justifieth my distinction of it, according to the various *Termini*; And here how he maketh the Righteousness of Christ to be but the *MEDIUM* of our Justification, (though he should have told us which sort of *Medium* he meaneth) he seemeth to me a very favourable consenting Adversary: And I doubt those Divines who maintain that Christ's Rigteousness is the *Causa Formalis* of our Justification, (who are no small ones, nor a few, though other in answer to the Papists disclaim it) yea, and those that make it

but

but *Causa Materialis*, (which may have a sound sense) will think this Learned Man betrayeth their Cause by prevarication, and seemeth to set fiercly against me, that he may yeeld up the Cause with less suspicion. But the truth is, we all know but in part, and therefore err in part, and Error is inconsistent with it self. And as we have conflicting Flesh and Spirit in the *Will*, so have we conflicting *Light* and *Darkness*, *Spirit* and *Flesh* in the Understanding; And it is very perceptible throughout this Author's Book, that in one line the *Flesh* and *Darkness* saith one thing, and in the next oft the *Spirit* and *Light* saith the contrary, and seeth not the inconsistency: And so though the *dark* and *fleshy* part rise up in wrathful striving Zeal against the Concord and Peace of Christians, on pretence that other Mens Errors wrong the Truth, yet I doubt not but Love and Unity have some interest in his lucid and Spiritual part. We do not only grant him that Christ's Righteousness is a *Medium* of our Justification, (for so also is *Faith* a *Condition*, and *Dispositio Receptiva* being a *Medium*); nor only some *Cause*, (for so also is the *Covenant-Donation*); but that it is an *efficient meritorious Cause*, and because if Righteousness had been that of our own, *Innocency* would have been founded in *Merit*, we may call Christ's Righteousness the *material Cause* of our Justification, remotely, as it is *Materia Meriti*, the Matter of the *Merit* which procureth it.

2. But for all this it followeth not that all Justification is only *Legal*, as *Legal* noteth its respect to the Law of Innocency: For 1. we are justified from or against the Accusation of being non-performers of the Condition of the Law of Grace;

2. And

2. And of being therefore unpardoned, and lyable to its forer Penalty. 3. Our particular subordinate Personal Righteousness consisting in the said performance of those Evangelical Conditions of Life, is so denominated from its conformity to the Law of Grace, (as it instituteth its own Condition) as the measure of it, (as *Rectitudo ad Regulam*). 4. Our *Jus ad impunitatem & vitam*, resulteth from the *Donative* Act of the Law or Covenant of Grace, as the *Titulus qui est Fundamentum Juris*, or supposition of our Faith as the Condition. 5. This Law of Grace is the *Norma Judicii*, by which we shall be judged at the Last Day. 6. The same Judg doth now *per sententiam conceptam* judg of us, as he will then judg *per sententiam prolatam*. 7. Therefore the Sentence being *virtually* in the Law, this same Law of Grace, which in *primo instanti* doth make *us Righteous*, (by *Condonation* and *Donation* of Right) doth *in secundo instanti*, *virtually* justifie us as containing that regulating use, by which we are to be sententially justified. And now judg Reader, whether no Justification be Evangelical, or by the Law of Grace, and so to be denominated: (for it is *lis de nomine* that is by him managed). 8. Besides that the whole frame of Causes in the Work of Redemption, (the Redeemer, his Righteousness, Merits, Sacrifice, Pardoning Act, Intercession, *&c.*) are sure rather to be called Matters of the Gospel, than of the Law.

And yet we grant him easily; 1. That Christ perfectly fulfilled the Law of Innocency, and was justified thereby, and that we are justified by that Righteousness of his, as the meritorious Cause.

2. That

2. That we being guilty of Sin and Death, according to the tenor of that Law, and that Guilt being remitted by Christ, as aforesaid, we are therefore justified from that Law, (that is, from its Obligation of us to Innocency as the necessary terms of Life, and from its Obligation of us to Death, for want of Innocency): But we are not justified by that Law, either as fulfilled or as satisfied by *us our selves*, either personally or by an Instrument, substitute or proper Representative, that was *Vicarius Obedientiæ aut pœnæ*. 3. And we grant that the Jews were delivered from the positive Jewish Law, which is it that *Paul* calleth, *The Law of Works*. And if he please, in all these respects to call *Justification Legal*, we intend not to quarrel with the name, (though what I called *Legal* in those *Aphorisms*, I chose ever after to call rather, *Justitia pro-legalis*). But we cannot believe him, 1. That it is *only Legal*; 2. Or that that is the *only* (or most) proper denomination.

§. 8. He proceedeth thus, [*And it will be vain, if any argue, That yet none can be saved without Evangelical Works, according to which it is confessed that all men shall be judged: for the distinction is easie (which the Author of the Aphorisms somewhere useth) between the first or Private, and the last or Publick Justification.—— In the first sense it is never said, That Works justifie, but contrary, That God justifieth him that worketh not*, Rom. 4. 5. *In the latter we confess that Believers are to be justified according to Works, but yet not Of (or By) Works, nor that that Justification maketh men just before God, but only so pronounceth them.*

Answ. 1. This is such another *Consenting Adversary*

versary as once before I was put to answer; who with open mouth calls himself consequentially what he calleth me; if the same *Cause*, and not the *Person* make the Guilt. Nay let him consider whether his *grand* and most *formidable Weapon* [*So also saith* Bellarmine, *with other Papists*] do not wound himself: For *they* commonly say, That *the first Justification* is not of *Works*, or *Works* do not first justifie us. Have I not now proved that he *erreth and complyeth with the Papists?* If not, let him use better Arguments himself.

2. But why is the first *Justification* called *Private?* Either he meaneth God's *making us just constitutively*, or his *judging* us so: and that *per sententiam conceptam* only, or *prolatam* also.

1. The common distinction in Politicks, *inter judicium Privatum & Publicum*, is fetcht from the *Judg*, who is either *Persona privata vel publica*: a *private* Man, or an *authorized Judg* judging as such: And so the Judgment of Conscience, Friends, Enemies, Neighbours, mere Arbitrators, *&c.* is *Judicium privatum*; and that of a *Judg in foro*, is *Judicium publicum*, (yea, or in secret, before the concerned Parties only in his Closet, so it be decisive): If this Learned Doctor so understand it, then, 1. *Constitutive Justification* (which is truly first) is publick Justification, being done by God the Father, and by our Redeemer, who sure are not herein *private* authorized *Persons*. 2. And the first *sentential Justification*, as merely *Virtual*, and not yet *Actual*, viz. as it's virtually in the Justifying Law of Grace as *norma Judicii* is *publick in suo genere*, being the *virtus* of a Publick Law of God, or of his Donative Promise. 3. And the

first

first *Actual Justification, per Deum Judicem per sententiam conceptam* (which is God's secret judging the Thing and Person to be as they are) is (secret indeed *in se*, yet revealed by God's publick Word but) publick as to the Judg. 4. And the first *sententia prolata* (the fourth in order) is someway publick as opposite to secresie, (for, 1. it is before the Angels of Heaven; 2 And in part by Executive demonstrations on Earth): But it is certainly by a *publick Judg*, that is, God. 5. And the first *Apologetical Justification* by Christ our *Interceding Advocate*, is publick both *quoad personam*, and as *openly* done in Heaven: And if this worthy Person deny any Justification *per sententiam Judicis*, upon our first Believing, or before the final Judgment, he would wofully fall out with the far greatest number of Protestants, and especially his closest Friends, who use to make *a Sentence* of *God* as Judg to be the *Genus* to Justification.

But if by [*Private* and *Publick Justification*]; he means [*secret* and *open*]. 1. How can he hope to be understood when he will use Political Terms unexplained, out of the usual sense of Politicians: But no men use to *abuse words* more than they that would keep the Church in flames by *wordy Controversies*, as if they were of the terms of Life and Death. 2. And even in that sense our first Justification is *publick* or open, *quoad Actum Justificantis*, as being by the Donation of a publick Word of God; Though *quoad effectum in recipiente*, it must needs be secret till the Day of Judgment, no Man knowing anothers Heart, whether he be indeed a sound Believer: And so of the rest as is intimated.

Con-

Concerning what I have said before, some may Object, 1. *That there is no such thing as our Justification notified before the Angels in Heaven.* 2. *That the* Sententia Concepta *is God's Immanent Acts, and therefore Eternal.*

Answ. To the first, I say, 1. It is certain by *Luk.* 15. 10. that the Angels know of the Conversion of a Sinner, and therefore of his Justification and publickly Rejoyce therein. Therefore it is notified to them. 2. But I refer the Reader for this, to what I have said to Mr. *Tombes* in my *Disputation of Justification*, where I do give my thoughts, That this is not the Justification by Faith meant by *Paul*, as Mr. *Tombes* asserteth it to be.

To the Second, I say, Too many have abused Theology, by the misconceiving of the distinction of *Immanent* and *Transient Acts* of God, taking all for *Immanent* which effect nothing *ad extra.* But none are properly *Immanent quoad Objectum*, but such as God himself is the *Object* of, (as *se intelligere, se amare*): An Act may be called indeed immanent in any of these three respects; 1. *Ex parte Agentis*; 2. *Ex parte Objecti*; 3. *Ex parte effectus.* 1. Ex *parte agentis*, all God's Acts are *Immanent*, for they are his Essence. 2. *Ex parte Objecti vel Termini*, God's Judging a Man Just or Unjust, Good or Bad, is transient; because it is denominated from the state of the *Terminus* or Object: And so it may be *various* and *mutable* denominatively, notwithstanding God's *Simplicity* and *Immutability.* And so the *Sententia Concepta* is not *ab Æterno.* 3. As to the *Effect*, all confess God's Acts to be Transient and Temporary. But there are some that *effect* not (as to judg a thing to be what it is). 3. Either

3. Either this Militant Disputer would have his Reader believe that I say, That a *Man is justified by Works*, in that which he called [*making just*, and the *first Justification*], or not: If he would, such *untruth* and *unrighteousness* (contrary to the full drift of many of my Books, and even that which he selected to oppose) is not a congruous way of disputing for *Truth* and *Righteousness*: nor indeed is it tolerably ingenuous or modest. If not, then why doth he all along carry his professed agreement with me, in a militant strain, perswading his Reader, that I favour of Socinianism or Popery, or some dangerous Error, by saying the very same that he saith. O what thanks doth God's Church owe such contentious Disputers for supposed Orthodoxness, that like *noctambuli*, will rise in their sleep, and cry, Fire, Fire, or beat an Allarm on their Drums, and cry out, *The Enemy*, *The Enemy*, and will not let their Neighbours rest!

I have wearied my Readers with so oft repeating in my Writings (upon such repeated importunities of others) these following Assertions about Works.

1. That we are never justified, first or last, by Works of *Innocency*.

2. Nor by the *Works* of the Jewish Law (which *Paul* pleadeth against).

3. Nor by any Works of Merit, in point of Commutative Justice, or of *distributive* Governing Justice, according to either of those Laws (of *Innocency*, or *Jewish*).

4. Nor by any Works or Acts of Man, which are set against or instead of the least part of God's Acts,

Acts, Christ's Merits, or any of his part or honour.

5. Nor are we at first justified by any *Evangelical Works of Love, Gratitude or Obedience to Christ*, as *Works* are distinguished from our first *Faith* and *Repentance*.

6. Nor are we justified by *Repentance*, as by an *instrumental* efficient Cause, or as of the same receiving Nature with Faith, except as *Repentance* signifieth our change from *Unbelief* to *Faith*, and so is *Faith* it self.

7. Nor are we justified by *Faith* as by a mere Act, or moral good Work.

8. Nor yet as by a proper efficient Instrument of our Justification.

9. Much less by such *Works* of Charity to Men, as are without true love to God.

10. And least of all, by Popish bad Works, called *Good*, (as Pilgrimages, hurtful Austerities, *&c.*)

But if any Church-troubling Men will first call *all Acts* of Man's Soul by the name of WORKS, and next will call no Act by the name of *Justifying Faith*, but the *belief of the Promise* (as some) or the *accepting* of *Christ's Righteousness given* or *imputed to us*, as *in se*, our own (as others) or [the *Recumbency on this Righteousness*] (as others) or all these three *Acts* (as others); and if next they will say that this *Faith justifieth* us only as the proper *Instrumental Cause*; and next that to look for Justification by any other Act of Man's Soul, or by this Faith in any other respect, is to trust to that Justification by *Works*, which *Paul* confuteth, and to fall from Grace, I do detest such corrupting and

abuſing of the Scriptures, and the Church of Chriſt. And I aſſert as followeth;

1. That the Faith which we are juſtified by, doth as eſſentially contain our belief of the Truth of Chriſt's Perſon, Office, Death, Reſurrection, Interceſſion, &c. as of the Promiſe of Imputation.

2. And alſo our conſent to Chriſt's Teaching, Government, Interceſſion, as to Imputation.

3. And our *Acceptance* of Pardon, Spirit, and promiſed Glory, as well as Imputed Righteouſneſs of Chriſt.

4. Yea, that it is eſſentially a Faith in God the Father, and the Holy Ghoſt.

5. That it hath in it eſſentially ſomewhat of Initial Love to God, to Chriſt, to Recovery, to Glory; that is, of Volition; and ſo of Deſire.

6. That it containeth all that Faith, which is neceſſarily requiſite at Baptiſm to that Covenant; even a *conſenting-practical-belief* in God the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghoſt*: and *is* our Chriſtianity it ſelf.

7. That we are juſtified by this *Faith*, as it is [*A moral Act of Man, adapted to its proper Office, made by our Redeemer, the Condition of his Gift of Juſtification, and ſo is the moral receptive aptitude of the Subject*, or the *Diſpoſitio materiæ vel ſubjecti Recipientis*]: Where the Matter of it is [*An adapted moral Act of Man*] (by Grace). The *Ratio formalis* of its Intereſt in our Juſtification is [*Conditio præſtita*] ſpeaking *politically*, and [*Aptitudo vel Diſpoſitio moralis Receptiva*] ſpeaking logically; which Dr. *Twiſs* ſtill calleth *Cauſa diſpoſitiva*.

8. That Repentance as it is a change of the Mind from Unbelief to Faith, (in God the Father, Son,

Son, and Holy Ghoſt) is this Faith denominated from its *Terminus à quo* (principally).

9. That we are continually juſtified by this Faith as continued, as well as initially juſtified by its firſt Act.

10. That as this *Faith* includeth a *conſent* to *future Obedience*, (that is, Subjection) ſo the *performance* of that *conſent* in *ſincere Obedience*, is the Condition of our Juſtification as continued (Secondarily) as well as Faith (or conſent it ſelf) primarily: And that thus *James* meaneth, that we are Juſtified by Works.

11. That God judging of all things truly as they are, now judgeth Men juſt or unjuſt, on theſe Terms.

12. And his Law being *Norma judicii*, now *vertually* judgeth us juſt on theſe terms.

13. And that the Law of Grace being that which we are to be judged by, we ſhall at the laſt Judgment alſo be judged (and ſo juſtified) thus far by or according to our ſincere Love, Obedience, or Evangelical Works, as the Condition of the Law or Covenant of free Grace, which juſtifieth and glorifieth freely all that are thus Evangelically qualified, by and for the Merits, perfect Righteouſneſs and Sacrifice of Chriſt, which procured the Covenant or free Gift of Univerſal Conditional Juſtification and Adoption, before and without any Works or Conditions done by Man whatſoever.

Reader, Forgive me this troubleſom oft repeating the ſtate of the Controverſie; I meddle with no other. If this be Juſtification by Works, I am for it. If this Doctor be againſt it, he is againſt much

of the Gospel. If he be not, he had better have kept his Bed, than to have call'd us to Arms in his Dream, when we have sadly warred so many Ages already about mere words. For my part, I think that such a short explication of our sense, and rejection of ambiguities, is fitter to end these quarrels, than the long disputations of Confounders.

4. But when he saith, [*Works make not a Man just, and yet we are at last justified according to them*], it is a contradiction, or unsound. For if he mean *Works* in the sence excluded by *Paul*, we are not justified *according to them, viz.* such as make, or are thought to make the *Reward to be not of Grace*, but *of Debt:* But if he take *Works* in the sense intended by *James, sincere Obedience* is a *secondary constitutive part* of that *inherent or adherent personal Righteousness, required by the Law of Grace, in subordination to Christ's Meritorious Righteousness*; And what Christian can deny this? So far it *maketh* us *Righteous*, (as *Faith* doth *initially*). And what is it to be *justified according to our Works*, but to be judged, so far as they are sincerely done, to be such as have performed the secondary part of the Conditions of free-given Life?

5. His [*According*] but not [*ex operibus*] at the Last Judgment, is but a Logomachie [*According*] signifieth as much as I assert: But [*ex*] is no unapt Prepositon, when it is but the subordinate part of Righteousness and Justification, of which we speak, and signifieth (with me) the same as [*According*].

6. His Tropical Phrase, that [*Works pronounce us just*] is another ambiguity: That the Judg will

will *pronounce us just according to them, as the foresaid second part of the Constitutive Cause*, or *Matter* of our *Subordinate Righteousness*, is certain from *Matth.* 25. and the scope of Scripture: But that they are only *notifying Signs*, and no part of the *Cause* of the day to be tryed, is not true, (which too many assert).

§. 9. He proceedeth, [*If there be an Evangelical Justification at God's Bar, distinct from the legal one, there will then also be in each an absolution of divers sins: For if the Gospel forgive the same sins as the Law, the same thing will be done, and a double Justification will be unprofitable and idle. If from divers sins, then the Law forbids not the same things as the Gospel*, &c.]

Answ. It's pitty such things should need any Answer.

1. It's a false Supposition, That *all Justification* is *Absolution from sin:* To justifie the sincerity of our *Faith* and *Holiness*, is one act or part of our Justification, against all (possible or actual) false Accusation.

2. The Law of Innocency commanded not the Believing Acceptance of Christ's Righteousness and Pardon, and so the Remnants of that Law in the hand of Christ (which is the Precept of perfect Obedience *de futuro*) commandeth it only consequently, supposing the Gospel-Promise and Institution to have gone before, and selected this as the terms of Life; so that as a *Law* in *genere* (existent only *in speciebus*) commandeth Obedience, and the Law of Innocency *in specie* commanded [*personal perfect*

perfect perpetual Obedience, as the Condition of Life]; so the Gospel commandeth *Faith* in our *Redeemer*, as the new Condition of Life: on which supposition, even the Law of lapsed Nature further obligeth us thereto: And as the Commands differ, so do the Prohibitions.

There is a certain sort of sin excepted from pardon, by the pardoning Law, *viz.* Final non-performance of its Conditions: And to judg a Man not guilty of this sin, is part of our Justification, as is aforesaid.

§. 10. He addeth, [*If Legal and Evangelical Justification are specie distinct, then so are the Courts in which we are justified. — If distinct and subordinate, and so he that is justified by the Law, is justified by the Gospel*, &c.]

Answ. 1. No Man is justified by the Law of Innocency or Works, but Christ: Did I ever say that, [*That Law justifieth us*], who have voluminously wrote against it? If he would have his Reader think so, his unrighteousness is such as civility forbids me to give its proper Epithets to. If not, against what or whom is all this arguing?

2. I call it [Legal] as it is that perfect Righteousness of Christ our Surety, conform to the Law of Innocency; by which he was justified (though not absolved and pardoned): I call it [*pro Legalis justitia*], because that Law doth not justifie us for it (but Christ only) but by it given us *ad effecta* by the New-Covenant; we are saved and justified from the Curse of that Law, or from Damnation, as certainly as if we had done it our selves: I call

Faith

Faith our Evangelical Righteousness, on the Reasons too oft mentioned. Now these may be called *Two Justifications*, or (rather) *two parts of one*, in several respects, as pleaseth the Speaker. And all such Word-Souldiers shall have their liberty without my Contradiction.

3. And when will he prove that these two Sorts, or Parts, or Acts, may not be at once transacted at the same Bar? Must there needs be *one Court* to try *whether I am a true Believer*, or an *Infidel*, or *Hypocrite*; and *another* to judg that *being such*, I am to be justified against all Guilt and Curse, by vertue of Christ's Merits and Intercession? Why may not these two parts of *one Man's Cause* be judged at the same Bar? And why must your Pupils be taught so to conceive of so great a business, in it self so plain?

§. 11. He proceedeth, [*The Use of this Evangelical Justification is made to be, that we may be made partakers of the Legal Justification out of us, in Christ: And so our Justification applyeth another Justification, and our Remission of sins another.*

Answ. No Sir; but our *particular subordinate sort of Righteousness*, consisting in the performance of the Conditions of the free Gift, (*viz.* a believing suitable *Acceptance*) is really our *Dispositio receptiva*, being the Condition of our Title to that *Pardon* and *Glory*, which for Christ's Righteousness if freely given us. And our *personal Faith and Sincerity* must be justified, and we *in tantum*, before our Right to Christ, Pardon and Life can be justified *in foro*

2. And to justifie us as sincere Believers, when others are condemned as Hypocrites, and Unbelievers, and Impenitent, is not Pardon of Sin. These Matters should have been put into your (excellent) Catechism, and not made strange, much less obscured and opposed, when laying by the quarrels about mere words, I am confident you deny none of this.

§. 12. He addeth, [*Then Legal Justification is nothing but a bare word, seeing unapplyed; as to the Matter it is nothing, as it is not called Healing by a Medicine not applyed; nor was it ever heard that one Healing did apply another*].

Answ. Alas, alas, for the poor Church, if this be the Academies best! sorrow must excuse my Complaint! If it be an Argument it must run thus: If *Legal* (or *pro-legal*) *Righteousness* (that is, our part in Christ's Righteousness) be none to us (or none of our Justification) when not-applyed, than it is none also when it is applyed: But, *&c.*

Answ. It is none till applyed: Christ's Merits, or Legal Righteousness justifie himself, but not us till applyed: (Do you think otherwise, or do you wrangle against your self?) But I deny your Consequence: How prove you that it is *none when applyed therefore?* Or the Cure is none when the Medicine is applyed?

Perhaps you'l say, That *then* our *Personal Righteousness*, and *subordinate Justification*, is ours before Christ's Righteousness, and so the greater dependeth on, and followeth the less.

Answ. 1.

Anſw. 1. Chriſt's own Righteouſneſs is before ours. 2. His Condition, Pardon to fallen Mankind is before ours. 3. This Gift being Conditional, excepteth the non-performance of the Condition; And the nature of a Condition, is to *ſuſpend the effect of the Donation* till *performed*. 4. Therefore the performance goeth before the ſaid Effect, and our Title. 5. But it is not therefore any *cauſe* of it, but a *removal* of the *ſuſpenſion*; nor hath the Donation any other dependance on it. And is not all this beyond denial with Perſons not ſtudiouſly and learnedly miſled?

But you ſay, *It was never heard that one Healing applyed another.*

Anſw. And ſee you not that this is a *lis de nomine*, and of a name of your own introduction for illuſtration? If we were playing at a Game of Tropes, I could tell you that the *Healing* of Mens *Unbelief* is applicatory for the *healing* of their *Guilt*; And the healing of Men's Ignorance, Pride, and Wrangling about words, and frightning Men into a Conceit that it is about Life and Death, is applicatory as to the healing of the Churches Wounds and Shame. But I rather chuſe to ask you, Whether it was never heard that a *particular ſubordinate perſonal Righteouſneſs* (even *Faith* and *Repentance*) was made by God the Condition of our Right to Pardon, and Life by Chriſt's Righteouſneſs? Did you never teach your Sholars this, (in what words you thought beſt?) And yet even our Faith is a Fruit of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs; but nevertheleſs the Condition of other Fruits.

If you ſay that our *Faith* or *Performance* is not

to

them) and tell me true, that [*No Man out of* Socinus *School hath*, &c.] To say nothing of many late Writings near us.

2. If I have, 1. never written one word against [*Imputation of Righteousness*] there or elsewhere; 2. Yea, have oft written for it; 3. And if those very Pages be for it which he accuseth; 4. Yea, if there and elsewhere I write more for it than *Olevian*, *Ursine*, *Paræus*, *Scultetus*, *Wendeline*, *Piscator*, and all the rest of those great Divines, who are for the *Imputation* only of the Passive Righteousness of Christ, when I profess there and often, to concur with Mr. *Bradshaw*, *Grotius*, and others that take in the Active also, yea and the Habitual, yea and Divine respectively, as advancing the Merits of the Humane; If all this be notoriously true, what Epithets will you give to this Academical Doctors notorious Untruth?

3. When that Book of *Aphorisms* was suspended or retracted between twenty and thirty years ago (publickly), because of many crude Passages and unapt Words, and many Books since written by me purposely, fully opening my mind of the same things; all which he passeth wholly by, save a late Epistle; what credit is to be given to that Man's ingenuity, who pretendeth that this being in all mens hands, the answering it will so far clear all the Controversie.

§. 2. Dr. *T.* [*He hence assaulteth the Sentence of the Reformed; because it supposeth, as he saith, that we were in Christ, at least, legally before we believed, or were born. But what proof of the consequence doth he*

he bring ?] (The rest are but his Reasons against the Consequences, and his talk against me, *as pouring out Oracles*, &c.)

Answ. 1. Is this the mode of our present Academical Disputers, To pass by the stating of the Controversie, yea, to silence the state of it, as laid down by the Author, whom he opposeth in that very place, (and more fully elsewhere often) ? Reader, the Author of the *Aphorisms*, pag. 45. and forward, distinguishing as Mr. *Bradshaw* doth, of the several senses of Imputation, and how Christ's Righteousness is made ours, 1. Beginneth with their Opinion, who hold, [*That Christ did so obey in our stead, as that in God's esteem, and in point of Law we were in Christ dying and suffering, and so in him we did both perfectly fulfil the Commands of the Law by Obedience, and the Threatnings of it by bearing the Penalty, and thus (say they) is Christ's Righteousness imputed to us*, viz. *His Passive Righteousness for the pardon of our sins, and deliverance from the Penalty ; His Active Righteousness for the making of us Righteous, and giving us title to the Kingdom ; And some say the Habitual Righteousness of his Humane Nature, instead of our own Habitual Righteousness ; Yea, some add the Righteousness of the Divine Nature*].

The second Opinion which he reciteth is this, [*That God the Father accepteth the sufferings and merits of his Son, as a valuable consideration on which he will wholly forgive and acquit the Offenders, and receive them into his favour, and give them the addition of a more excellent happiness, so they will but receive his Son on the terms expressed in the Gospel.*

And

And as distinct from theirs, who would thus have the *Passive Righteousness only imputed*, he professeth himself to hold with *Bradshaw*, *Grotius*, &c. that the Active also is so imputed, being *Justitia Meriti*, as well as *Personæ*, and endeavoureth to prove it: But not imputed in the first rigid sense, as if God esteemed us to *have been*, and *done*, and *suffered* our *selves in* and *by Christ*, and merited *by him*. Thus he states the Controversie; And doth this Doctor fight for Truth and Peace, by 1. passing by all this; 2. Saying, I am against Imputed Righteousness; 3. And against the Reformed? Were not all the Divines before named Reformed? Was not *Camero*, *Capellus*, *Placeus*, *Amyrald*, *Dallæus*, *Blondel*, &c. Reformed? Were not *Wotton*, *Bradshaw*, *Gataker*, &c. Reformed? Were not of late Mr. *Gibbons*, Mr. *Truman*, to pass many yet alive, Reformed? Must that Name be shamed, by appropriating it to such as this Doctor only?

2. And now let the Reader judg, with what face he denieth the Consequence, (that it *supposeth us to have been in Christ legally*, &c.) When as I put it into the Opinion opposed, and opposed no other. But I erred in saying, that [*most of our ordinary Divines*] hold it; But he more in fathering it in common on the Reformed.

§. 2. Dr. *T.* [2. *Such Imputation of Righteousness*, he saith, *agreeth not with Reason or Scripture: But what Reason meaneth he? Is it that vain, blind, maimed, unmeasurably procacious and tumid Reason of the Cracovian Philosophers?* —— *Next he saith,*

saith, Scripture is silent of the Imputed Righteousness of Christ; what a saying is this of a Reformed Divine? so also Bellarmine, *&c.*

Answ. Is it not a doleful case that *Orthodoxness* must be thus defended? Is this the way of vindicating Truth? 1. Reader, my words were these, (just like *Bradshaws*) [*It teacheth Imputation of Christ's Righteousness in so strict a sense, as will neither stand with Reason, nor the Doctrine of the Scripture, much less with the PHRASE of Scripture, which mentioneth no Imputation of Christ or his Righteousness*]. 1. Is this a denying of Christ's Righteousness imputed? Or only of that intollerable *sense* of it? 2. Do I say here that Scripture mentioneth not Imputed Righteousness, or only that strict sense of it? 3. Do I not expressly say, It is the *Phrase* that is not to be found in Scripture, and the unsound sense, but not the sound?

2. And as to the Phrase, Doth this Doctor, or can any living Man find that *Phrase* in Scripture, [*Christ's Righteousness is imputed to us*]? And when he knoweth that it is not there, are not his Exclamations, and his Bug-bears [*Cracovian Reason*, and *Bellarmine*] his dishonour, that hath no better Weapons to use against the Churches Peace? To tell us that the *sense* or Doctrine is in Scripture, when the question is of the *Phrase*, or that Scripture speaketh in his rigid sense, and not in ours, is but to lose time, and abuse the Reader, the first being impertinent, and the second the begging of the Question.

§. 3.

§. 3. Dr. T. *The Greek word answering to Imputation, is ten times in* Rom. 4. *And what is imputed but Righteousness? we have then some imputed Righteousness. The Question is, only what or whose it is, Christ's or our own? Not ours, therefore Christs: If ours, either its the Righteousness of Works, or of Faith,* &c.

Answ. 1. But what's all this to the *Phrase?* Could you have found that Phrase [*Christ's Righteousness is imputed*], why did you not recite the words, but *Reason* as for the sense?

2. Is that your way of Disputation, to prove that the Text speaketh of the *Imputation of Christ's Righteousness*, when the Question was only, *In what sense?* What kind of Readers do you expect, that shall take this for rational, candid, and a Plea for Truth?

3. But to a Man that cometh unprejudiced, it is most plain, that *Paul* meaneth by [*imputing it for Righteousness*] that the Person was or is, *accounted, reckoned*, or *judged Righteous*, where *Righteousness* is mentioned as the *formal Relation* of the Believer: so that what-ever be the matter of it (of which next') the *formal Relation* sure is our *own*, and so here said: And if it be from the matter of Christ's Righteousness, yet that must be *our own*, by your Opinion. And it must be *our own*, *in* and *to* the proper *Effects*, in mine. But sure it is not the same *numerical* formal Relation of [*Righteousness*] that is in Christ's *Person*, and *in* ours: And it's that formal Relation, as in *Abraham*, and not in Christ, that is called *Abraham*'s Reputed Righteousness

ouſneſs in the Text: I ſcarce think you will ſay the contrary.

§. 4. Dr. *T.* [*But Faith is not imputed to us for Righteouſneſs.*

Anſw. Expreſly againſt the words of the Holy Ghoſt there oft repeated. Is this defending the Scripture, expreſly to deny it? Should not reverence, and our ſubſcription to the Scripture ſufficiently rather teach us to diſtinguiſh, and tell in *what ſenſe it is imputed*, and in *what not*, than thus to deny, without diſtinction, what it doth ſo oft aſſert? Yea, the Text nameth *nothing elſe as ſo imputed, but Faith.*

§. 5. *If it be imputed, it is either as ſome Virtue, or Humane Work, (the τὸ Credere) or as it apprehendeth and applyeth Chriſt's Righteouſneſs? Not (the firſt) —— If Faith be imputed relatively only, as it applyeth to a Sinner the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, it's manifeſt that it's the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt only that is imputed, and that Faith doth no more to Righteouſneſs, than an empty hand to receive an Alms.*

Anſw. 1. Sure it doth as a voluntarily receiving hand, and not as a mere *empty hand.* And voluntary grateful Reception may be the Condition of a Gift.

2. You and I ſhall ſhortly find that it will be the Queſtion on which we ſhall be Juſtified or Condemned; not only whether we received Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, but whether by Faith we received Chriſt in all the Eſſentials of his Office, and to all the eſſential ſaving Uſes: Yea, whether according to the ſenſe of the Baptiſmal Covenant, we firſt be-

lievingly received, and gave up our selves to God the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*, and after performed sincerely that Covenant.

3. But let me defend the Word of God: Faith is imputed for Righteousness, even *this Faith now described*; 1. *Remotely*, *ex materiæ aptitudine*, for its fitness to its formal Office; And that fitness is, 1. Because it is an *Act of Obedience to God*, or *morally good*, (for a *bad* or *indifferent Act* doth not justifie). 2. More specially as it is the *receiving*, *trusting*, and *giving* up *our selves* to God the *Father*, Son, and Holy Ghost, to the proper ends of Redemption, or a suitable Reception of the freely offered Gift; and so connoteth Christ the Object (for the Object is essential to the Act *in specie*). 2. But proximately *Faith* is so *reputed*, or imputed, as it is the *performance* of the *Condition* of the Justifying Covenant or Donation.

And to be *imputed* for *Righteousness*, includeth, That [*It is the part required of us by the Law of Grace, to make us partakers of the Benefits of Christ's Righteousness, which meriteth Salvation for us instead of a legal and perfect Righteousness of our own*, (which we have not). Or, [*Whereas we fell short of a Righteousness of Innocency, Christ by such a Righteousness hath merited our Pardon and Salvation, and given title to them by a New Covenant of Grace, which maketh this Faith the Condition of our Title; and if we do this, we shall be judged evangelically Righteous; that is, such as have done all that was necessary to their right in Christ and the said Benefits, and therefore have such a Right*].

This is plain English, and plain Truth, wrangle no more against it, and against the very Letter of the

the Text, and againſt your Brethren and the Churches Concord, by making Men believe that there are grievous Differences, where there are none.

Reader, I was going on to Anſwer the reſt, but my time is ſhort, Death is at the door: Thou ſeeſt what kind of Work I have of it, even to detect a Learned Man's Overſights, and temerarious Accuſations. The wearineſs will be more to thee and me, than the profit: I find little before, but what I have before anſwered here, and oft elſewhere; And therefore I will here take up, only adding one Chapter of Defence of that Conciliation which I attempted in an Epiſtle to Mr. *W. Allens* Book of the Two Covenants, and this Doctor, like an Enemy of Peace, aſſaulteth.

CHAP. VIII.

The Concord of Protestants in the Matter of Justification defended, against Dr. Tullies *Oppositions, who would make Discord under pretence of proving it.*

§. 1. WHile *Truth* is pretended by most, that by *envious striving* introduce *Confusion*, and *every evil Work*, it usually falleth out by God's just Judgment, that such are almost as opposite to *Truth*, as to *Charity* and *Peace*. What more palpable instances can there be, than such as on such accounts have lately assaulted me: Mr. *Danvers*, Mr. *Bagshaw*, &c. and now this Learned Doctor. The very stream of all his Opposition against me about Imputation, is enforced by this oft repeated Forgery, that I deny *all Imputation of Christ's Righteousness:* Yea, he neither by *fear*, *modesty*, or *ingenuity*, was *restrained* from writing, *pag.* 117. [*Omnem ludibrio habet Imputationem*] [*He derideth all Imputation*]. Judg by this what credit contentious Men deserve.

§. 2. The conciliatory Propositions which I laid down in an Epistle to Mr. *W. Allens* Book, I will here transcribe, that the Reader may see what it is that these Militant Doctors war against.

Lest

Lest any who know not how to stop in mediocrity, should be tempted by Socinians or Papists, to think that we countenance any of their Errors, or that our Differences in the point of Justification by Faith or Works, are greater than indeed they are; and lest any weak Opinionative Persons, should clamour unpeaceably against their Brethren, and think to raise a name to themselves for their differing Notions; I shall here give the Reader such evidences of our real Concord, as shall silence that Calumny.

Though some few Lutherans did, upon peevish suspiciousness against *George Major* long ago, assert, That [Good Works are not necessary to Salvation]: And though some few good Men, whose Zeal without Judgment doth better serve their own turn than the Churches, are jealous, lest all the good that is ascribed to Man, be a dishonour to God; and therefore speak as if God were honoured most by saying the worst words of our selves; and many have uncomely and irregular Notions about these Matters: And though some that are addicted to sidings, do take it to be their Godly Zeal to censure and reproach the more understanding sort, when they most grosly err themselves: And though too many of the People are carried about through injudiciousness and temptations to false Doctrines and evil Lives; yet is the Argument of Protestants thus manifested.

1. They all affirm that Christ's Sacrifice, with his Holiness and perfect Obedience, are the meritorious Cause of the forgiving Covenants, and of our Pardon and Justification thereby, and of our Right to Life Eternal, which it giveth us. And that this Price was not paid or given in it self im-

mediately to us, but to God for us; and so, that our foresaid Benefits are its Effects.

2. They agree that Christ's Person and ours were not really the same; and therefore that the same Righteousness, which is an Accident of one, cannot possibly be an Accident of the other.

3. They all detest the Conceit, that God should aver, and repute a Man to have done that which he never did.

4. They all agree that Christ's Sacrifice and Merits are really so effectual to procure our Pardon, Justification, Adoption, and right to the sealing Gift of the Holy Ghost, and to Glory, upon our Faith and Repentance; that God giveth us all these benefits of the New-Covenant as certainly for the sake of Christ and his Righteousness, as if we had satisfied him, and merited them our selves: and that thus far Christ's Righteousness is ours in its Effects, and imputed to us, in that we are thus used for it, and shall be judged accordingly.

5. They all agree, that we are justified by none, but a practical or working Faith.

6. And that this Faith is the Condition of the Promise, or Gift of Justification and Adoption.

7. And that Repentance is a Condition also, though (as it is not the same with Faith, as Repentance of Unbelief is) on another aptitudinal account; even as a willingness to be cured, and a willingness to take one for my Physician, and to trust him in the use of his Remedies, are on several accounts the Conditions on which that Physician will undertake the Cure, or as willingness to return to subjection and thankful acceptance of a purchased Pardon, and of the Purchasers Love and future

future Authority, are the Conditions of a Rebel's Pardon.

8. And they all agree, that in the first instant of a Man's Conversion or Believing, he is entred into a state of Justification, before he hath done any outward Works: and that so it is true, that good Works follow the Justified, and go not before his initial Justification: as also in the sense that *Austin* spake it, who took Justification, for that which we call Sanctification or Conversion.

9. And they all agree, that Justifying Faith is such a receiving affiance, as is both in the Intellect and the Will; and therefore as in the Will, participateth of some kind of Love to the justifying Object, as well as to Justification.

10. And that no Man can chuse or use Christ as a Means (so called, in respect to his own intention) to bring him to God the Father, who hath not so much love to God, as to take him for his end in the use of that means.

11. And they agree, that we shall be all judged according to our Works, by the Rule of the Covenant of Grace, though not for our Works, by way of commutative, or legal proper merit. And Judging is the Genus, whose Species is Justifying and Condemning: and to be judged according to our Works, is nothing but to be justified or condemned according to them.

12. They all agree, that no Man can possibly merit of God in point of Commutative Justice, nor yet in point of Distributive or Governing Justice, according to the Law of Nature or Innocency, as *Adam* might have done, nor by the Works of the Mosaical Law.

13. They all agree, that no Works of Mans are to be trusted in, or pleaded, but all excluded, and the Conceit of them abhorred.

1. As they are feigned to be against, or instead of the free Mercy of God.

2. As they are against, or feigned, instead of the Sacrifice, Obedience, Merit, or Intercession of Christ.

3. Or as supposed to be done of our selves, without the Grace of the Holy Ghost.

4. Or as supposed falsly to be perfect.

5. Or as supposed to have any of the afore-disclaimed Merit.

6. Or as materially consisting in Mosaical Observances.

7. Much more in any superstitious Inventions.

8. Or in any Evil mistaken to be Good.

9. Or as any way inconsistent with the Tenor of the freely pardoning Covenant. In all these senses Justification by Works is disclaimed by all Protestants at least.

14. Yet all agree, that we are created to good Works in Christ Jesus, which God hath ordained, that we should walk therein; and that he, that nameth the Name of Christ, must depart from iniquity, or else he hath not the Seal of God; and that he that is born of God sinneth not; that is, predominantly. And that all Christ's Members are Holy, Purified, zealous of Good Works, cleansing themselves from all filthiness of Flesh and Spirit, that they might perfect Holiness in God's fear, doing good to all Men, as loving their Neighbours as themselves; and that if any Man have not the

Sancti-

Sanctifying Spirit of Christ, he is none of his, nor without Holiness can see God.

15. They all judg reverently and charitably of the Ancients, that used the word [Merit of Good Works], because they meant but a moral aptitude for the promised Reward, according to the Law of Grace through Christ.

16. They confess the thing thus described themselves, however they like not the name of Merit, lest it should countenance proud and carnal Conceits.

17. They judg no Man to be Heretical for the bare use of that word, who agreeth with them in the sense.

18. In this sense they agree, that our Gospel-Obedience is such a necessary aptitude to our Glorification, as that Glory (though a free Gift) is yet truly a reward of this Obedience.

19. And they agree, that our final Justification by Sentence at the Day of Judgment doth pass upon the same Causes, Reasons, and Conditions, as our Glorification doth.

20. They all agree, that all faithful Ministers must bend the labour of their Ministry in publick and private, for promoting of Holiness and good Works, and that they must difference by Discipline between the Obedient and the Disobedient. And O! that the Papists would as zealously promote Holiness and good Works in the World, as the true serious Protestants do, whom they factiously and peevishly accuse as Enemies to them; and that the Opinion, Disputing, and name of good Works, did not cheat many wicked Persons into self-flattery and Perdition, while they are void of that which

they

they dispute for. Then would not the Mahometans and Heathens be deterred from Christianity by the wickedness of these nominal Christians, that are near them: nor would the serious practice of that Christianity, which themselves in general profess, be hated, scorned, and persecuted by so many, both Protestants and Papists; nor would so many contend that they are of the True Religion, while they are really of no Religion at all any further, than the Hypocrites Picture and Carcass may be called Religion: Were Men but resolved to be serious Learners, serious Lovers, serious Practisers according to their knowledg, and did not live like mockers of God, and such as look toward the Life to come in jest, or unbelief, God would vouchsafe them better acquaintance with the True Religion than most Men have.

§. 3. One would think now that this should meet with no sharp Opposition, from any Learned lover of Peace; and that it should answer for it self, and need no defence. But this Learned Man for all that, among the rest of his Military Exploits, must here find some Matter for a Triumph.

And 1. *Pag.* 18. he assaulteth the third Propos. [*They all detest the Conceit, that God should aver, and repute a Man to have done that which he never did*].

And is not this true? Do any sober Men deny it, and charge God with Error or Untruth? Will not this Man of Truth and Peace, give us leave to be thus far agreed, when we are so indeed?

But

But saith he, [*Yea, the Orthodox abhor the contrary, if* [*to have done it*] *be taken* in sensu forensi, *(for in a Physical and Personal, they abhor it not, but deride it): Doth the Aphorist abhor these and such-like sayings:* [*We are dead, buried, risen from the Dead with Christ?*]

Answ. 1. Take notice Reader, that it is but the *Words*, and not the *Matter* that he here assaulteth; so that all here seemeth but *lis de nomine.* He before, *pag.* 84. extolleth *Chrysostom* for thus expounding, [*He made him sin for us*]; *that is, to be condemned as an Offender, and to die as a Blasphemer.* And this sense of Imputation we all admit; (But *Chrysostom* in that place oft telleth us, That by [Sin] he meaneth both one counted a wicked Man by his Persecutors, [not by God] and one that suffered that cursed Death, which was due to wicked cursed Men: And which of us deny not Justification by Works as *Chrysostom* doth? I subscribe to his words, [*It is God's Righteousness; seeing it is not of Works (for in them it were necessary that there be found no blot) but of Grace, which blotteth out and extinguisheth all sin: And this begetteth us a double benefit, for it suffereth us not to be lift up in mind, because it is all the Gift of God, and it sheweth the greatness of the benefit*]. This is as apt an Expression of my Judgment of *Works* and *Grace* as I could chuse. But it's given to some Men to extol that in one Man, which they fervently revile in others. How frequently is *Chrysostom* by many accused as favouring Free-Will, and Man's Merits, and smelling of Pelagianism? And he that is acquainted with *Chrysostom*, must know, That he includeth all these things in Justification. 1. Remis-

sion

sion of the Sin, as to the Punishment. 2. *Remission* of it by *Mortification*, (for so he calleth it, in *Rom.* 3. *p.* (*mihi*) 63.) 3. *Right to Life* freely given for Christ's sake. 4. And *Inherent Righteousness* through Faith: And he oft saith, That this is called the *Righteousness of God, because as God, who is living, quickeneth the dead, and as he that is strong giveth strength to the weak; so he that is Righteous, doth suddenly make them Righteous that were lapsed into sin*], as he there also speaketh. And he oft tells us, It is *Faith it self*, and not only Christ believed in, that is imputed for Righteousness, or Justifieth: And in *Rom.* 4. *p.* 80. he calleth the Reward, [the *Retribution of Faith*]. And *pag.* 89. he thus conjoyneth [*Faith and Christ's Death*] to the Question, *How Men obnoxious to so much sin are justified,* [*he sheweth that he blotted out all sin, that he might confirm what he said, both from the Faith of* Abraham *by which he was justified, and from our Saviours Death, by which we are delivered from sin*]. But this is on the by.

2. But saith Dr. *T. The Orthodox abhor the contrary* in sensu forensi.

Answ. How easie is it to challenge the Titles of *Orthodox*, *Wise*, or *good Men* to ones self? And who is not Orthodox, himself being Judg? But it seems with him, no Man must pass for Orthodox that is not in so gross an error of his Mind, (if these words, and not many better that are contrary must be the discovery of it) *viz.* That will not say, that *in sensu forensi, God esteemeth Men to have done that which they never did.* The best you can make of this is, that you cover the same sense, which I plainlier express, with this illfavoured Phrase

Phraſe of Man's inventing: But if indeed you mean any more than I by your *ſenſus forenſis*, *viz.* that ſuch a *ſuffering* and *meriting* for us may, in the lax improper way of ſome Lawyers ſpeaking, be called, [*Our own Doing*, *Meriting*, *Suffering*, &c.] I have proved, that the Doctrine denied by me, ſubverteth the Goſpel of Chriſt.

Reader, I remember what *Grotius*, (then Orthodox, thirty years before his Death) in that excellent Letter of Church-Orders, Predeſtination, Perſeverance, and Magiſtrates, animadverting on *Molinæus*, ſaith, *How great an injury thoſe Divines, who turn the Chriſtian Doctrine into unintelligible Notions and Controverſies, do to Chriſtian Magiſtrates; becauſe it is the duty of Magiſtrates to diſcern and preſerve neceſſary ſound Doctrine, which theſe Men would make them unable to diſcern.* The ſame I muſt ſay of their injury to all Chriſtians, becauſe all ſhould hold faſt that which is proved True and Good, which this ſort of Men would diſable them to diſcern. We juſtly blame the Papiſts for locking up the Scripture, and performing their Worſhip in an unknown Tongue. And alas, what abundance of well-meaning Divines do the ſame thing by undigeſted Terms and Notions, and unintelligible Diſtinctions, not adapted to the Matter, but cuſtomarily uſed from ſome Perſons reverenced by them that led the way? It is ſo in their Tractates, both of Theology and other Sciences; and the great and uſeful Rule, *Verba Rebus aptanda ſunt*, is laid aſide: or rather, Men that underſtand not Matter, are like enough to be little skilful in the expreſſing of it: And as Mr. *Pemble* ſaith, A cloudy unintelligible ſtile, uſually ſignifieth a cloudy

dy unintelligent Head, (to that sense): And as Mr. *J. Humfrey* tells Dr. *Fullwood*, (in his unanswerable late Plea for the Conformists against the charge of Schism) *pag. 29.* [*So overly are men ordinarily wont to speak at the first sight, against that which others have long thought upon*]; that some Men think, that the very jingle of a distinction not understood is warrant enough for their reproaching that Doctrine as dangerous and unsound, which hath cost another perhaps twenty times as many hard studies, as the Reproachers ever bestowed on that Subject.

To deliver thee from those Learned Obscurities, read but the Scripture impartially, without their Spectacles and ill-devised Notions, and all the Doctrine of Justification that is necessary, will be plain to thee: And I will venture again to fly so far from flattering those, called Learned Men, who expect it, as to profess that I am perswaded the common sort of honest unlearned Christians, (even Plowmen and Women) do better understand the Doctrine of Justification, than many great Disputers will suffer themselves or others to understand it, by reason of their forestalling ill-made Notions: these unlearned Persons commonly conceive, 1. That Christ in his own Person, as a Mediator, did by his perfect Righteousness and Sufferings, merit for us the free pardon of all our sins, and the Gift of his Spirit and Life Eternal, and hath promised Pardon to all that are Penitent Believers, and Heaven to all that so continue, and sincerely obey him to the end; and that all our after-failings, as well as our former sins, are freely pardoned by the Sacrifice, Merits, and Intercession of Christ, who also giveth

us

us his Grace for the performance of his impoſed Conditions, and will judg us, as we have or have not performed them]. Believe but this plain Doctrine, and you have a righter underſtanding of Juſtification, than many would let you quietly enjoy, who tell you, [That Faith is not imputed for Righteouſneſs; that it juſtifieth you only as an Inſtrumental Cauſe, and only as it is the reception of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, and that no other Act of Faith is juſtifying, and that God eſteemeth us to have been perfectly Holy and Righteous, and fulfilled all the Law, and died for our own ſins, in or by Chriſt, and that he was politically the very Perſon of every Believing Sinner]; with more ſuch like.

And as to this diſtinction which this Doctor will make a Teſt of the Orthodox, (that is, Men of of his Size and Judgment) you need but this plain explication of it.

1. *In Law-ſenſe, a Man is truly and fitly ſaid himſelf to have done that, which the Law or his Contract alloweth him to do either by himſelf or another*; (as to do an Office, or pay a Debt by a Subſtitute or Vicar). For ſo I do it by my Inſtrument, and the Law is fulfilled and not broken by me, becauſe I was at liberty which way to do it. In this ſenſe I deny that we ever fulfilled all the Law by Chriſt; and that ſo to hold ſubverts all Religion as a pernicious Hereſie.

2. But in a tropical improper ſenſe, he may be ſaid to [*be eſteemed of God to have done what Chriſt did; who ſhall have the benefits of Pardon, Grace, and Glory thereby merited, in the manner and meaſure given by the free Mediator, as certainly as if he had*

had done it himself]. In this improper sense we agree to the *Matter*, but are sorry that improper words should be used as a snare against sound Doctrine, and the Churches Love and Concord. And yet must we not be allowed *Peace ?*

§. 4. But my free Speech here maketh me remember how sharply the Doctor expounded and applyed one word in the retracted Aphorisms : I said (not of the *Men*, but of the *wrong Opinion* opposed by me) [*It fondly supposeth a Medium betwixt one that is just, and one that is no sinner*] *one that hath his sin or guilt taken away, and one that hath his unrighteousness taken away : It's true in bruits and insensibles that are not subjects capable of Justice*, there is, *&c. There is a Negative Injustice which denominateth the Subject* non-justum, *but not* injustum, *where Righteousness is not due. But where there is the* debitum habendi, *its privative.* The Doctor learnedly translateth first the word [*fondly*] by [*stolide*]; and next he *(fondly*, though not *stolidè)* would perswade the Reader, that it is said of the *Men*, though himself translate it [*Doctrina*].

And next he bloweth his Trumpet to the War, with this exclamation, [*Stolide ! O vocis mollitiem, & modestiam ! O stolidos Ecclesiæ Reformatæ Clarissimos Heroas ! Aut ignoravit certè, aut scire se dissimulat, (quod affine est calumniæ) quid isti statuant, quos loquitur, stolidi Theologi*].

Answ. 1. How blind are some in their own Cause ? Why did not Conscience at the naming of Calumnie say, [*I am now committing it ?*] It were better write in English, if Latin translations must needs

needs be so false! we use the word [*fond*] in our Country, in another sense than [*fooliſh*]; with us it signifieth any byassed Inclination, which beyond reason propendeth to one side: and so we use to say, That *Women are fond of their Children*, or of any thing *over-loved*: But perhaps he can use his Logick, to gather by consequences the Title of the *Person*, from the Title of his *Opinion*, and to gather [*fooliſhly*] by consequence out of [*fondly*]. To all which I can but answer, That if he had *made himself* the *Translator* of my Words, and the Judg of my Opinions; if this be his best, he should not be chosen as such by me. But it may be he turned to *Riders Dictionary*, & found there [*fondly, vide fooliſhly*].

2. The *Stolidi Theologi* then is his own phrase! And in my Opinion, another Mans Pen might better have called the Men of his own Opinion [*Eccleſiæ Reformatæ clariſſimos Heroas*] compared with others! I take *Gataker*, *Bradshaw*, *Wotton*, *Camero*, and his followers; *Urſine*, *Olevian*, *Piſcator*, *Paræus*, *Wendeline*, and multitudes such, to be as famous Heroes as himself: But this also on the by.

§. 5. But I must tell him whether I abhor the Scripture Phrase, [*We are dead, buried, and risen with Christ*].

I answer, No; nor will I abhor to say, That *in ſenſu forenſi*, *I am one political Person with Christ*, and am *perfectly holy* and *obedient* by and *in him*, and died and redeemed my self by him, when he shall prove them to be Scripture Phrases: But I desire the Reader not to be so *fond*, (pardon the word) as by this bare question to be enticed to believe, that it is any of the meaning of those Texts that use that Phrase which he mentioneth, that

[*Legally*, or *in sensu forensi, every Believer is esteemed by God to have* himself personally *died a violent death on the Cross, and to have been buried, and to have risen again*, and ascended into Heaven, nor yet to be now there in Glory, because Christ did and doth all this in our very Legal Person. Let him but 1. consider the Text, 2. and Expositors, 3. and the Analogy of Faith, and he will find another sense; *viz.* That *we so live by Faith on a dying, buried, risen and glorified Saviour, as that as such he dwelleth objectively in our Hearts, and we partake so of the Fruits of his Death, Burial, and Resurrection, and Glory, as that we follow him in a Holy Communion, being dead and buried to the World and Sin, and risen to newness of Life, believing that by his Power we shall personally, after our death and burial, rise also unto Glory.* I will confess that we are perfectly *holy and obedient by and in Christ*, as far as we are now *dead, buried*, and *risen* in him.

§. 6. And here I will so far look back, as to remember, That he (as some others) confidently telleth us, That [*the Law bound us both to perfect Obedience, and to punishment for our sin, and therefore pardon by our own suffering in Christ, may stand with the reputation, that we were perfectly Obedient and Righteous in Christ.*]

Answ. And to what purpose is it to dispute long, where so notorious a contradiction is not only not discerned, but obtruded as *tantum non* necessary to our Orthodoxness, if not to our Salvation? I ask him,

1. Was not Christ as our Mediator perfectly holy habitually, and actually, without Original or Actual Sin? 2. If

2. If all this be reputed to be *in se*, our own as *subjected in* and *done* by *our selves political*, or *in sensu forensi*; Are we not then reputed *in foro*, to have no original or actual sin, but to have innocently fulfilled all the Law, from the first hour of our lives to the last? Are we reputed *innocent* in Christ, as to *one* part only of our lives, (if so, which is it?) or as to all?

3. If as to all, is it not a *contradiction* that in Law-sense, we are reputed perfectly Holy and Innocent, and yet sinners.

4. And can he have need of Sacrifice or Pardon, that is reputed never to have sinned (legally)?

5. If he will say that in Law-sense, we have or are *two Persons*, let him expound the word *Persons* only, as of *Qualities* and *Relations*, (nothing to our Case in hand); or else say also, That as we are holy and perfect in one of our own Persons, and *sinful*, *unrighteous*, or *ungodly* in another; so a Man may be in Heaven in one of his own Persons, and on Earth, yea and in Hell in the other: And if he mean that the same Man is *justified* in his Person in Christ, and condemned in his other Person; consider which of these is the *Physical* Person, for I think its that which is like to suffer.

§. 7. *pag.* 224. He hath another touch at my Epistle, but gently forbeareth contradiction as to *Num.* 8. And he saith so little to the 11*th*, as needeth no answer.

§. 8. *pag.* 127. He assaulteth the first *Num.* of *N.* 13. That *we all agree against any conceit of Works that are against or instead of the free Mercy of God*].

And what hath he against this? Why that

which taketh up many pages of his Book, and seemeth his chief strength in most of his Contest, *viz.* [*The Papists say the same*] and [so saith *Bellarmine*]. It's strange that the same kind of Men that deride *Fanatick Sectaries*, for crying out in Church-Controversies, [O *Antichristian Popery*, *Bellarmine*, &c.] should be of the same Spirit, and take the same course in greater Matters, and not perceive it, nor acknowledg their agreement with them! But as Mr. *J. Humfrey* saith in the foresaid Book of the word [*Schism, Schism*] oft canted out against them, that will not sacrilegiously surrender their Consciences, or desert their Ministry, [*The great Bear hath been so oft led through the streets, that now the Boys lay by all fear, and laugh or make sport at him*] so say I of this Sectarian Bugbear, [*Popery, Antichristian, Bellarmine*] either the Papists really say as we do, or they do not. If not, is this Doctor more to be blamed for making them *better than* they are, or for making *us worse?* which ever it be, *Truth* should defend *Truth*. If they do, I heartily rejoyce, and it shall be none of my labour any more (whatever I did in my *Confession of Faith*) to prove that they do not. Let who will manage such ungrateful Work. For my part, I take it for a better Character of any Opinion, that Papists and Protestants agree in it, than that the Protestants hold it alone. And so much for [*Papists* and *Bellarmine*] though I think I know better what they teach, than his Book will truly tell me.

§. 9. But he addeth, [*Humane Justifying Works are in reality adverse to the free Mercy of God, therefore to be accounted of no value to Righteousness*].

Answ.

Answ. 1. But whose phrase is *Justifying Works?*

2. Doth not the *Holy Ghost* say, That a *Man is justified by Works*, and *not by Faith only?* Jam. 2.

3. Doth not Christ say, *By thy words thou shalt be justified?*

4. Do not I over and over tell the World, That I hold Justification by Works in no sense, but as signifying the same as [*According to Works*] which you own? And so both *Name* and *Thing* are confessed by you to be Scriptural.

5. I have before desired the Reader to turn to the words, [*Righteous, Righteousness, Justification*, &c.] in his Concordance. And if there he find *Righteousness* mentioned as consisting in some Acts of Man, many hundred times, let him next say if he dare, that they are to *be had in no price to Righteousness:* Or let him read the Texts cited by me in my *Confession of Faith.*

6. Because, Faith, Repentance, Love, Obedience, are that whose sincerity is to be judged in order to our Life or Death ere long; I will not say that they are to be vilified as to such a Righteousness or Justification, as consisteth in our vindication from the charge of Impenitency, Infidelity, Unholiness, Hypocrisie, *&c.* The reading of *Mat.* 25. resolved me for this Opinion.

§. 10. Next he noteth our detesting such Works as are against or instead of Christ's Sacrifice, Righteousness, Merits, *&c.* To this we have the old Cant, *The Papists say the like.*

Reader, I proved that the generality of Protestants are agreed in all those twenty Particulars, even in all the material Doctrines about Man's Works and Justification, while this warlike Doctor

would ſet us all together by the ears ſtill; he is over-ruled to aſſert that the Papiſts alſo are agreed with us. The more the better, I am glad if it be ſo, and will here end with ſo welcome a Concluſion, that maketh us all herein to be Friends: only adding, That when he ſaith that [*ſuch are all Works whatever*, (even Faith it ſelf) *which are called into the very leaſt part of Juſtification*]; even as a *Condition or ſubordinate perſonal Evangelical Righteouſneſs*, ſuch as Chriſt and *James*, and a hundred Texts of Scripture aſſert; I anſwer, I cannot believe him, till I ceaſe believing the Scriptures to be true; which I hope will never be: And am ſorry that ſo worthy a Man can believe ſo groſs an Opinion, upon no better reaſons than he giveth: And yet imagine, that had I the opportunity of free conference with him, I could force him to manifeſt, That he himſelf differeth from us but in meer words or ſecond Notions, while he hotly proclaimeth a greater diſcord.

A N

94

AN ANSVVER TO Dr. *TULLIES* Angry Letter.

By *Rich. Baxter.*

LONDON,
Printed for *Nevil Simmons* and *Jonath. Robinſon*, at the Princes-Arms and Golden-Lion, in St. *Pauls* Church-yard, 1675.

An Answer to Dr. Tullies *Angry Letter.*

Reverend Sir,

IF I had not before *perceived* and *lamented* the great *Sin of Contenders*, the dangerous *snare for ignorant* Christians, and the *great Calamity* of the Church, by making *Verbal Differences* seem *Material*, and variety of some Arbitrary Logical Notions, to seem *tantum non*, a variety of Religions; and by frightning Men out of their Charity, Peace, and Communion, by Bugbear-Names, of this or that *Heresie* or *dangerous Opinion*, which is indeed but a Spectrum or Fantasm of a dreaming or melancholy Brain, your *Justificatio Paulina*, and your *Letter* to me, might be sufficient means of my full Conviction. And if once reading of your Writings do not yet more increase my love of the *Christian simplicity*, and plain old *Divinity*, and the amicable Communion of practical Christians upon those terms, and not medling with Controversies in a militant way, till by long impartial studies they are well understood, I

must

must confess my non-proficience is very unexcusable.

With your self I have no great business: I am not so vain as to think my self able to *understand you*, or to be *understood* by you: and I must not be so bold as to tell you why, much less will I be so injurious to the Reader, as by a *particular examining all your words*, to extort a confession that their *sense* is *less* or *worse* than I could wish: For *cui bono?* What would this do but more offend you? And idle words are as great a fault in writing as in talk: If I have been guilty of too many, I must not so much add to my fault, as a too particular examination of such Books would be. But for the sake of your *Academical Youth*, whom you thought meet to allarm by your Caution, I have answered so much of your Treatise as I thought necessary to help even Novices to answer the rest themselves. For their sakes (though I delight not to offend you) I must say, That if they would not be deceived by such Books as yours, it is not an *Answer* to them that must be their preservative, but an orderly studying of the Doctrines handled; Let them but learn truly the several senses of the word [*Justification*], and the *several sorts*, and *what they are*, and still constrain *ambiguous words* to confess *their sense*, and they will need no other Answer to such Writings.

And as to your Letter (passing by the spume and passion) I think these few Animadversions may suffice.

§. I. Between twenty and thirty years ago, I did in a private Disputation prove our guilt of the sins of our nearer Parents; and because many

doubted

doubted of it, I have oft since in other writings mentioned it: About three years ago, having two Books of Mr. *William Allens* in my hand to peruse, in order to a Publication, (a *Perswasive to Unity*, and a *Treatise of the Two Covenants*); in a Preface to the latter, I said, [*That most Writers, if not most Christians, do greatly darken the Sacred Doctrine, by overlooking the Interest of Children in the Actions of their nearer Parents, and think that they participate of no guilt, and suffer for no original sin, but* Adam's *only*, &c.] You fastened on this, and *warned seriously the Juniors, not rashly to believe one that brings forth such Paradoxes of his* (or *that*) *Theologie*, which you added to your [*O cæcos ante Theologos quicunque unquam fuistis*]: The charge was expressed by [*aliud inveniisse peccatum Originale, multo citerius quam quod ab* Adamo *traductum est*]. Hereupon I thought it enough to publish that old private Disputation, which many before had seen with various Censures: Now you send me in your Letter the strange tidings of the success: You that deterred your *Juniors* by so frighful a warning, seem now not only to *agree with me*, that we *are guilty of our nearer Parents sin*, and contract additional pravity from them as such, (which was my Assertion) but over-do all others, and Truth it self in your Agreement! Now you take it for an injury to be reported to think otherwise herein than I do: yea, and add, [*Which neither I, nor any Body else I know of, denies as to the thing, though in the extent, and other circumstances, all are not agreed, and you may in that enjoy your Opinion for me*]. This is too kind: I am loth to tell you how many

that

that I know, and have read, deny it, lest I tempt you to repent of your Agreement.

But doth the World yet need a fuller evidence, that some Men are *de materiâ* agreed with them, whom they raise the Country against by their Accusations and Suspicions?

But surely what passion or spatling soever it hath occasioned from you, I reckon that my labour is not lost: I may tell your *Juniors*, that I have sped extraordinary well, when I have procured the published consent of such a Doctor. Either you were of this mind *before* or *not*: If not, it's well you are brought to confess the Truth, though not to confess a former Error. If yea, then it's well that so loud and wide a seeming disagreement is confessed to be none, that your Juniors may take warning, and not be frightned from Love and Concord by every melancholy Allarm.

Yea, you declare your conformity to the Litany, [*Remember not our Offences, nor the Offences of our Fore fathers*], and many words of indignation you use for my questioning it. All this I like very well as to the Cause; And I matter it not much how it looks at me: If you *agree* more *angrily* than others disagree, the *Cause* hath some advantage by the Agreement. Though me-thinks it argueth somewhat unusual, that seeming Dissenters should close by so vehement a Collision.

But yet you *will not agree* when you *cannot chuse but agree*, and you carry it still as if your Allarm had not been given without cause: Must we *agree*, and not *agree?* What yet is the Matter? Why it is [*a new original sin*]. My ordinary expressions of it,

it may be fully seen in the Disputation: The phrase you laid hold on in a Preface is cited before, [*That we participate of no guilt, and suffer for no original sin but* Adam's *only*], I denied. And what's the dangerous *Errour* here? That our *nearer Parents* sin was *Adams*; I may presume that you hold not. That we are *guilty* of such, you *deny not*: That *it is sin*, I find you not denying: sure then all the difference must be in the word [ORIGINAL].

And if so, you that so hardly believe your loud-noised disagreements to be but *verbal*, must patiently give me leave here to try it. Is it any more than the *Name* ORIGINAL that you are so heinously offended at? Sure it is not: Else in this Letter purposely written about it, you would have told your *Reader what it is*. Suffer me then to summon your Allarm'd Juniors to come and see what a *Spectrum* it is that must affright them; and what a Poppet-Play or dreaming War it is, that the Church is to be engaged in, as if it were a matter of Life and Death? *Audite juvenes!* I took the word [ORIGINAL] in this business to have several significations. First, That is called [*ORIGINAL*] *Sin*, which was the *ORIGO* of all other sins in the Humane World: And that was not *Adam*'s *sin*, but *Eves*.

2. That which was the *ORIGO* of sin to all the World, save *Adam* and *Eve*, communicated by the way of Generation: And that was *Adams* and *Eves* conjunct, *viz.* 1. Their first sinful Acts; 2. Their Guilt; 3. And their habitual pravity (making it full, though in Nature following the Act). This Sin, Fact, Guilt, and Habit, as Accidents

cidents of the Persons of *Adam* and *Eve*, are not Accidents of our Persons.

3. *Our personal participation*; 1. *In the guilt* of the sin of *Adam* and *Eve*; 2. And of a vicious *privation* and *habit* from them, as soon as we are Persons. Which is called *Original* sin, on three accounts conjunct; 1. Because it is a participation of their *Original Act* that we are guilty of; 2. Because it is in us *ab Origine*, from our *first Being*; 3. And because it is the *Origo* of all our *Actual Sins*.

4. I call that also [ORIGINAL] (or *part of Original Sin)* which hath but the two later only; *viz.* 1. Which is in us *AB ORIGINE*, from our first personal being; 2. Which is the *Root* or *ORIGO* in our selves of all our *Actual Sins:* And thus our *Guilt* and *Vice* derived from our *nearer Parents*, and not from *Adam*, is our *Original Sin*; That is, 1. Both *Guilt* and *Habit* are in us from our *Original*, or first Being; 2. And all our Actual Sin springeth from it as a partial Cause: For I may presume that this Reverend Doctor doth not hold that *Adam*'s sin derived to us is in one *part* of the *Soul*, (which is not partible) and our nearer *Parent*'s in another; but will grant that it is *one vitiosity* that is derived from both, the latter being a Degree added to the former; though the *Reatus* having more than *one fundamentum*, may be called *diverse*. That *Origo & Active & passive dicitur*, I suppose we are agreed. Now I call the *vicious Habits* contracted from our nearer Parents by special reason of *their own sins*, superadded to the degree, which else we should have derived from *Adam*,

Adam, a *part* of our *original ſinful Pravity*, even a ſecondary part. And I call our *guilt* of the ſins of our *nearer Parents* (not *Adam*'s) which you will, either a *ſecondary Original Guilt*, or *Sin*, or a ſecondary *part* of our *Original Guilt*. See then our dangerous diſagreement: I call that ORIGINAL, which is in us *ab Origine*, when we are firſt Perſons, and is partly the Root or *Origo* in us of all our following Actual Sin: though it was not the *Original Sin* of *Mankind*, or the firſt of Sins. The Doctor thinks this an Expreſſion, which all *Juniors* muſt be warned to take heed of, and to take heed of the Doctrine of him that uſeth it. The Allarm is againſt this dangerous word [*ORIGINAL*]. And let a Man awake tell us what is the danger.

But I would bring him yet to agreement even *de nomine*, though it anger him. 1. Let him read the *Artic. 9. of the Church of England*, and ſeeing there *Original Sin* is ſaid to be that *corruption of Nature whereby we are far gone from Original Righteouſneſs*, and *are of our own Nature inclined to evil, ſo that the fleſh luſteth againſt the Spirit. The luſt of the fleſh called* φρόνημα σαρκὸς, *which ſome do expound the Wiſdom, ſome Senſuality, ſome the Affection, ſome the deſire of the Fleſh, not ſubject to the Law of God*]: Seing a degree of all this ſame Luſt is in Men from the ſpecial ſins of their Fore-fathers, as well as from *Adam*'s; Is not this Degree here called *Original Sin?* (why the Church omitted the *Imputed Guilt* aforeſaid, I enquire not).

2. If this will not ſerve, if he will find me any Text of Scripture, which uſeth the Phraſe, [*ORIGINAL Sin*], I will promiſe him hereafter to uſe

uſe it in no other ſenſe, than the Scripture uſeth it.

3. If that will not ſerve, if the Maſters of Language will agree, (yea, to paſs by our *Lexicons*, if the Doctors of that Univerſity will give it us under their hands) that the word [ORIGINAL] is unaptly and dangerouſly applyed to that ſinful *Guilt* and *Pravity* which is in us *ab Origine Noſtræ exiſtentiæ*, and is the internal *Radix vel Origo* of all our Actual Sin, in part of Cauſality, I will uſe that Epithete ſo no more.

4. If all this will not ſerve, if he himſelf will give me a *fitter Epithete*, I will uſe it: And now we *over-agree* in Doctrine, a word ſhall not divide us, unleſs he will be angry becauſe we are agreed, as *Jonas* was that the *Ninivites* were ſpared, becauſe it ſeemed to diſgrace his Word.

§. II. *pag.* 4, 5, &c. You invite me to, [*a full entire retractation of my Doctrine of Juſtification* (you add, *By Works*) and the *ſecondary Original Sin*].

1. Will you take it well if I retract that which you profeſs now to hold, and know none that denyeth, then there is no pleaſing you: If I muſt be thonght to wrong you for ſeeming to differ from you, and yet muſt retract all: What, yours and all Mens?

2. Do you mean the *words* or the *ſenſe* of *Juſtification* (as you call it) *by Works*? For the words, I take you for a ſubſcriber to the 39 *Articles*; and therefore that you reject not the Epiſtle of St. *James*: And for the *ſenſe*, I confeſs it is a motion ſuitable to the Intereſt of your *Treatiſe*, (though not of the Truth): He that cannot confute the Truth, would

would more easily do his Work, if he could perswade the Defenders of it to an *Entire Retractation*. Hereupon, *pag.* 5. you recite my words, of the difficulty of bringing some Militant Divines to yield: Your Admonition for Self-Application of them is useful, and I thank you for it: But is it not a streight that such as I am in, between two contrary sorts of Accusers? When Mr. *Danvers*, and Multitudes on that side, Reproach me daily for *Retractations*, and *you* for want of them? How natural is it now to Mankind, to desire to be the Oracles of the World, and that all should be *Silenced*, or *Retracted*, which is against their Minds? How many call on me for Retractation? Mr. *Tombes*, and Mr. *Danvers*, for what I have Written for Infants-Baptism: The *Papists* for what I have Written against them: And how many more? And as to what I *have Retracted*, *One* reproached me for it, and another either knoweth not of it, or perswadeth others that it is not done.

You say, *pag.* 6. [*A great out-cry you have made of me, as charging you with things you have Retracted*—— And pag. 7. *What's the reason you have not hitherto directed us to the particulars of your Recantation, what, when, where?*—— *You direct one indeed, to a small Book, above Twenty years a-go retracted.*—— *All I can pick up of any seeming Retractation*, is that you say, *that Works are necessary at least to the continuation of our Justification.*

Answ. Either this is Written by *a Wilful*, or a *Heedless* mistaking of my words. The first I will not suspect; it must therefore be the second, (for I must not judg you *Unable* to understand plain English). And is it any wonder if you have

many such Mistakes in your disputes of Justification, when you are so *heedless* about a matter of Fact? Where did I ever say, that I had *Recanted?* Or that I *Retracted* any of the Doctrine of Justification, which I had laid down? Cannot you distinguish between *Suspending*, or *Revoking*, or *Retracting* a *particular Book*, for the sake of several *Crude and Incongruous* Expressions, and Retracting or Recanting *that Doctrine of Justification?* Or can you not understand words, that plainly thus Distinguish? Why talk you of *what*, and *when*, and *where*, and conjecture at the *words*, as if you would make the Reader believe, that indeed it is some confessed Errors of mine, which you Confuted? and that I take it for an Injury, because I Retracted them? And so you think you salve your Confutation, whatever you do by your Candour and Justice: But you have not so much as Figleaves for either. It was the *Aphorisms*, or *Book*, that I said was above Twenty years a go Revoked: When in my Treatise of Infant-Baptism, I had craved Animadversions on it, and promised a better Edition, if I Published it any more; I forbad the Reprinting it, till I had time to Correct it; and when many called for it, I still deny'd them. And when the *Cambridg* Printer Printed it a second time, he did it by Stealth, pretending it was done beyond Sea. In my *Confession* Twenty years ago, I gave the Reasons, *Preface*, *pag.* 35. [*I find that there are some Incautelous Passages in my Aphorisms, not fitted to their Reading, that come to suck Poyson, and seek for a Word to be Matter of Accusation and Food for their Censuring opinionative Zeal.*—— And pag. 42. *If any Brother understand not any word in*

my

my Aphorisms which is here Interpreted, or mistake my sense about the Matter of that Book, which is here more fully opened; I must expect, that they interpret that by this. And if any one have so little to do as to write against that Book (which is not unlikely) if he take the Sense contrary to what I have here and else-where since then Published, I shall but neglect him as a Contentious, Vain Wrangler, if not a Calumniator]. I Wrote this sharply, to forwarn the Contentious, not knowing then that above Twenty years after, Dr. *Tully* would be the Man. Pag. 43. [*If any will needs take any thing in this Book to be rather a Retractation, than an Explication, of what I have before said, though I should best know my own Meaning; yet do such commend me, while they seem to blame me: I never look to write that which shall have no need of Correction.*—— And Cap. 1 pag. 2. [*Lest I should prove a further Offence to my Brethren, and a Wrong to the Church, I desired those who thought it worth their Labour, to vouchsafe me their Animadversions, which I have spent much of these Three last years in considering, that I might Correct what-ever was discovered to be Erroneous, and give them an account of my Reasons of the rest. I have not only since SUPPRESSED that Book which did offend them, but also laid by those Papers of Universal Redemption, which I had written, lest I should be further offensive,* &c.] In my Apologie else-where I have such-like Passages, ever telling Men that [*It was the first Book I wrote in my Unexperienced Youth; that I take the Doctrines of it to be sound and needful, save that in divers places they are unskilfully and incautelously worded.* (As the Word [*Covenant*] is oft put for [*Law,*] &c.) And that

I wrote my *Confession*, and *Disputes* of *Justification*, as an Exposition of it; and that I *Retracted*, or *Suspended*, or *Revoked*, not the *Doctrine*, but the *Book*, till I had Corrected it, and did disown it as too unmeet an Expression of my Mind, which I had more fully expresst in other *Books*.

And is not this plain English? Doth this warrant a *Wise* and *Righteous* Man, to intimate that I accuse him of writing against that Doctrine of Justification which I *Recanted*, and to call for the *What*, and *Where*, and *When?* Yea, and tell me, that I [*refer you to a small Book*] when instead of *referring* you to it, I only blame you for referring to that alone, when I had said as before?

When many Divines have published the first Edition of their Works imperfectly, and greatly corrected and enlarged them in a Second (as *Beza* his *Annotations*, *Polanus* his *Syntagma*, and many such) all Men take it for an Injury for a Neighbour twenty years after, to select the first Edition to confute as the Author's Judgment: Much more might I, when I published to the World, that I *Suspended the whole Book*, and *have these twenty* four years hindred the Printing of it; professing that I have in many larger Books, more intelligibly and fully opened the same things.

Yea, you fear not *pag.* 23. to say, That I tell you of *about* 60 *Books* of *Retractations*, in *part at least which I have Written*]; when never such a word fell from me. If I say, That one that hath published his *Suspension* of a *small Book* written in *Youth*, not for the *Doctrine of it*, but *some unfit* Expressions, and hath since in al-most thirty Years time, written about sixty Books, in many or most

most of which is somewhat of the same Subject, and in some of them he fullier openeth his Mind; should be dealt with by an Adversary, according to some of his later and larger Explications, and not according to the Mode and Wording of that one Suspended Book alone: Shall such a Man as you say, that I [*tel you of about sixty Books of Retractations*]? Or will it not abate Mens reverence of your disputing Accurateness, to find you so untrusty in the Recitation of a Man's words? The truth is, it is this great Defect of *Heed* and *Accurateness*, by hasty Temerity, which also spoileth your Disputations.

But, *pag.* 7. the Aphorisms must be, [*The most Schollar-like, and Elaborate (though Erroneous) Book in Controversie, you ever Composed*]. Answ. 1. Your Memory is faulty: Why say you in the next, that I *appeal* to my Disputation of Justification and *some others*; *but you cannot Trudg up and down, to every place I would send you, your Legs are too weak?* Either you had read all the sixty Books which you mention (the Controversal at least) or not: If *not*, How can you tell that the Aphorisms is the most *Elaborate*? If *yea*, Why do you excuse your Trudging, and why would you select a Suspended Book, and touch none that were Written at large on the same Subject? 2. By this (I suppose to make your Nibble to seem a Triumph) you tell your Reader again, how to value your Judgment. Is it like that any Dunce that is diligent, should Write no more *Schollar like* at Sixty years of Age than at Thirty? And do you think you know better what of mine is *Elaborate*, than I do? Sure that Word might have been spared;

When I know that one printed Leaf of Paper hath cost me more Labour than all that Book; and perhaps one Scheme of the Distinctions of Justification, which you deride. If indeed you are a competent Judg of your own Writings, Experience assureth me, that you are not so of mine. And *pag.* 25. you say, You *desire not to be preferred before your Betters, least of all when you are singular*; as here I think you are.

§. III. Pag. 9. You are *offended* for being *put in the Cub, with divers mean and contemptible Malefactors.*]

Answ. O for Justice! 1. Was not *Bellarmin*, or some of the *Papists* and the *Socinians*, as great Malefactors, with whom (as you phrase it) you put me in the Cub? 2. Are *they Malefactors* so far as they *agree with you in Doctrine*, and are *you Innocent?* What is the Difference between *your Treatise*, in the part that toucheth me, and that of Mr. *Eyres*, Mr. *Crandon*, and some others such? Dr. *Owen*, and Dr. *Kendale*, indeed differed from you; the latter seeking (by Bishop *Usher*) an amicable Closure, and the former (if I understand his Book on the *Hebrews*) less differing from me in Doctrine, than once he either did, or seemed to do. (And if any of us all grow no Wiser in thirty years Study, we may be ashamed). But to give you your due Honour, I will name you with your Equals, as far as I can judg, *viz.* *Maccovius*, *Cluto*, *Coccejus*, and *Cloppenburgius*, (I mean but in the Point in Question; it's no Dishonour to you to give some of them Precedencie in other things). It may be also *Spanhemius*, was near you. But

(if

(if I may presume to liken my Betters) no Men seem to me to have been so like you, as *Guilielmus Rivet*, (not *Andrew*), Mr. *George Walker*, and Mr. *Roborough*. (I hope this Company is no Dishonour to you). And very unlike you are *Le Blank*, *Camero*, *Davenant*, Dr. *Hammond*, Mr. *Gataker*, Mr. *Anthony Wotton*, and in Complexion *Scotus* and *Ockam*, and such as they: If yet I have not Chosen you pleasing Company, I pray you choose so your self.

But you say on, [*Had you not (in your Memory many Scores of greatest Eminence and Repute in the Christian World, of the same Judgment with me—— Know you not, I speak the same thing with all the Reformed Churches*, &c.—— *For shame let it be the Church of* England, *with all the rest of the Reformed*, &c.]

Answ. 1. I know not what you hold, even when I read what you write: (I must hope as well as I can, that you know your self): How then should I know who are *of the same Judgment* with you?

2. Yet I am very confident, that all they whom you mention, are of the same in some thing or other; and in particular, that we are *Justified by Faith, and not by the Works of the Law, or any Works in the sence denied by St.* Paul, *&c.*

3. Do not I, with as great Confidence as you, lay Claim to the same Company and Concord? And if one of us be mistaken, must your bare Word determine which it is? Which of us hath brought the fuller Proofs? I subscribe to the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, as well as you; and my Condition these thirteen or fourteen years, giveth

as much Evidence, that I am loth to subscribe to what I believe not, as yours doth of you. And you that know which of my Books is the most Elaborate, sure know, that in that Book which I Wrote to explain those Aphorisms (called my *Confession*) I cite the Words of *above an Hundred Protestant Witnesses*, that give as much to *Works* as I do: And that of this Hundred, one is the *Augustine* Confession, one the *Westminster* Synod, one the Synod of *Dort*, one the Church of *England*, each one of which being Collectives, contain many. (And here I tell you of more). And have you brought *more* Witnesses? Or *any* to the contrary? Did you *Confute*, or once *take Notice* of any of these?

4. Do you not here before you are aware, let your Reader know that it was, and still is, in the Dark, that you Alarm the World about our *dangerous Differences*, and run to your Arms undrest, before your Eyes are open? *Qui conveniunt in aliquo tertio*, &c. They that agree with the Church of *England*, in the Doctrine of Justification by Faith, do so far agree between themselves: But Dr. *Tullie*, and *R. B.* do agree with the Church of *England*, in the Doctrine of Justification by Faith. *Ergo.*—— The Article referreth to the Homilies, where it is more fully Explained.

5. May not I then retort your Argument, and bid you [*For shame let it be no longer* Bellarmine, *and* R. B. *but the Church of* England, *and all the Reformed, and* R. B.]? Disprove the Witnesses twenty years ago, produced by me in this very Cause; or else speak out, and say, [*The Church of* England, *and the rest of the Reformed, hold Justification by Works*,

Works, just as Bellarmine *and the Papists do*] which is it which you would fasten on me, who agree with them (as if you had never there read my Answer to Mr. *Crandon*, objecting the same thing).

§. IV. Your Censure, *pag.* 10, 11. of my *Windings*, *Clouds* of *Novel Distinctions*, *Preambles*, *Limitations*, &c. is just such as your Treatise did bid me expect: Till you become guilty of the same Crime, and fall out with *Confusion*, and take not equivocal ambiguous Words unexplained, instead of Univocals, in the stating of your Questions, I shall never the more believe that *Hannibal* is at the Gates, or the City on Fire, for your Allarms.

§. V. *Pag.* 11. Where you tell me, that [*You have no Profit by my Preface:* I shall not deny it, nor wonder at it; you are the fittest Judge: Where you say, that [*I have no Credit,*] You do but tell the World at what Rates you write. *Honor est in honorante.* And have all my Readers already told you their Judgment? Alas! How few? In all *London*, not a Man hath yet given me Notice of his Dislike, or Dissent. And sure your *own Pen* is a good Confuter of you. It is *some Credit*, that such a Man as you, is forced to profess a *full Consent* to the Doctrine, though with passionate Indignation.

You tell me of [*Nothing to the Question*]. But will you not be angry if I should but tell you, how little you did to *state* any Question, and in Reason must be supposed, when you assaulted my Doctrine,

Doctrine, to take it *as I ſtated it*; which I have fully ſhewed you?

You tell me, that *You Charged me only with new Original Sin, underived from* Adam, *unknown, unheard of before, in the Chriſtian World.*

Anſw. De re, is not our Guilt of nearer Parent's Sins ſuch which you and all that you know (now at laſt) confeſs? *De nomine,* 1. Tell the World if you can, when I called it [*New Original Sin, or underived from* Adam, *or unknown, or unheard of*]. There are more ways than one of Derivation from *Adam.* It is not derived from him by ſuch *Imputation* as his firſt Sin; but it is derived from him as a *partial Cauſa Cauſæ,* by many Gradations. All Sin is ſome-way from him. Either you mean that *I ſaid, that it was not Derived from* Adam, or you gather it by ſome Conſequence from what I ſaid. If the Firſt, ſhew the Words, and the Shame ſhall be mine. If not, you know the old Law, that to falſe Accuſers, it muſt be done as they would have done to the Accuſed. But if it be your *Conſequence,* prove it, and tell the World, what are the Premiſes that infer it.

§. VI. *Pag.* 12. You friendly help me to *profit by my ſelf,* however you profeſs that *you profit not* by me! What I have ſaid to you againſt [*Haſty Judging*], I have firſt ſaid to my ſelf, and the more you warn me of it, the more friendly you are: If it be not againſt ſuch as you but *my ſelf,* it is againſt my ſelf that I have a Treatiſe on that Subject; but I begin to think my ſelf in this more *Seeing* than you; for I *ſee it both in my ſelf and you,* and *you* ſeem to ſee it in *me,* and *not in your*

your self. But with all Men, I find, that to see the Spots in our own Face immediately is hard, and to love the Glass which sheweth them, is not easie; especially to some Men that neither are low, nor can endure to be so, till there is no Remedy.

But, Sir, how easie a Way of Disputing have you happily light on, Who instead of Examining the hundred Witnesses which I brought, and my else-where oft proving the Doctrine opposed by me to be *Novel, and Singular*, do in few words talk of your *holding the Doctrine delivered to the Saints*, and of the *many Worthies that concur with you*, and of my *pelting at their Heads, and dragging them by the Hoary-heads, as a Spectacle and By-word to all*, (by proving their consent by express Citations) *what Armies, and of what Strength appear against me, whose Names I defie and wound, through yours?*

Answ. And is not he a weak Man that cannot talk thus upon almost any Subject? But who be these Men, and what *be* their Names? Or rather, first, rub your Eyes, and tell us what is the *Controversie? Tully* sometimes talkt at this rate in his Orations, but verily much better in his Philosophy.

And you see no cause to repent, but you *bless God that you can again and again call to all Youth, that as they love the Knowledg of Truth, they take me not for an Oracle in my bold dividing Singularities*].

Answ. That the Name of *Truth* is thus abused, is no News; I would the Name of God were not: And I am sorry, that *you see no Cause to repent.* I am obliged to love you the better, for being against

againſt *dividing Singularities* in the general *Notion*; I hope if you *knew* it, you would not be *for them*, as in *ſingular Exiſtents*. But ſure, none at *Oxford* are in danger of taking me for *an Oracle?* This is another needleſs Work. So *Spanhemius* took that for a Singularity, which *Dallæus* in a large Catalogue, hath proved the Common Judgment of the Church, till Contention of late cauſed ſome Diſſenters.

Will you ceaſe theſe empty general Oſtentations, and chooſe out any one Point of real Difference between you and me about Juſtification, and come to a fair Trial, on whoſe ſide the Churches of Chriſt have been for 1500 years after Chriſt; yea, bring me but any two or one conſiderable Perſon, that was for a thouſand years for your Cauſe againſt mine, and I will ſay, that you have done more to confute me by far, than yet you have done; and if *two only* be againſt me, I will pardon you for calling me Singular.

§. VII. *Pag.* 13, 14, 15. You again do keep up the *Dividing Fear*, are offended that I perſwade you, that by *Melancholy Phantaſms you ſet not the Churches together by the Ears, and make People believe that they differ, where they do not:* And you ask, *Who began the Fray?*

Anſw. 1. Do you mean that I began with *you?* You do not ſure: But is it that I *began with the Churches*, and you were *neceſſitated to defend* them? Yes, if *Gallus*, *Ambſdorfius*, *Schluſſelburgius*, and Dr. *Criſpe*, and his Followers, be the Church? But, Sir, I provoke you to try it by the juſt Teſtimony of Antiquity, *who began to differ from the Churches.*

In

In this Treatise I have given you some Account, and *Vossius* hath given you more. which you can never answer: But if my Doctrine put you upon this Necessity, what hindred you from perceiving it these twenty years and more, till now? O Sir, had you *no other work* to do, but to Vindicate the Church and Truth? I doubt you had.

§. VIII. But *pag.* 15. You are again incredulous, that [*All the Difference betwixt you and me, or others of the same Judgment in the Point of Justification, is meerly Verbal; and that in the Main we are agreed*]. And again you complain of your *weak Legs*.

Answ. 1. I do agree with very many against *their wills in Judgment* (because the *Judgment* may be *constrained*), but with none in *Affection*, as on their part. Did I ever say, that *I differed not from you?* I tell you, I know not what your Judgment is, nor know I *who is* of your Mind? But I have not barely *said*, but oft proved, that (though not the *Antinomians*) the *Protestants* are mostly here agreed in the Main. If you could not have time to read my larger Proof, that short Epistle to Mr. *Allen's* Book of the Covenant, in which I proved it, might have stopt your Mouth from calling for more Proof, till you had better confuted what was given.

But you say, [*Are perfect Contradictions no more than a difference in Words? Faith alone, and not Faith alone? Faith with and without Works? Excuse our Dulness here*].

Answ. 1. Truly, Sir, it is a tedious thing, when a Man hath over and over Answered such Ob-

Objections; yea, when the full Answers have been twenty years in Print, to be put still to say over all again, to every Man that will come in and say, that *his Legs* are *too weak* to go see what was answered before: How many score times then, or hundreds, may I be called to repeat.

2. If I must pardon your *Dulness*, you must pardon my *Christianity* (or chuse) who believe that there is no such [*perfect Contradictions*] between Christ's, [*By thy Words thou shalt be Justified*] and *Paul's*, [*Justified by Faith, without the Works of the Law*] or [*not of Works*]; and *James's* [*We are justified by Works, and not by Faith only*]. Must we needs proclaim *War* here, or cry out, *Heresie*, or *Popery?* Are not all these Reconcileable? Yea, and *Pauls* too, *Rom.* 2. *The Doers of the Law shall be justified.*

3. But did I ever deny that it is [*by Faith alone and without Works*]? Where, and when? But may it not be, *by Faith alone* in one sense, and not *by Faith alone* in another sense?

4. But even where you are speaking of it, you cannot be drawn to distinguish of *Verbal* and *Real Differences.* Is it here the *Words*, or *Sense*, which you accuse? The *Words* you dare not deny to be *Gods own* in Scripture, spoken by *Christ*, *Paul*, and *James.* My *Sense* I have opened to you at large, and you take no Notice of it; but as if you abhorred *Explication* and *Distinction*, speak still against the *Scripture Words.*

§. IX. *Pag.* 16. But you say, [*Let any discerning Reader compare the* 48 §. *of this Preface with the Words* in pag. 5. *of your Appeal to the Light,*

and

and 'tis likely he will concur with me, in that *Melancholy Phantasm*, or *Fear:* For *'tis worth the noting, how in that dark Appeal where you distinguish of Popish Points*, i. e. *some-where the Difference is reconcileable, others in effect but in words; we have no Direction upon which Rank we must bestow Justification, nothing of it at all from you, Name or Thing: But why, next to the All-seeing God, you should know best your self*].

Answ. Alas, Sir, that *God* should be in such a manner mentioned! I answered this same Case at large in my Confession, Apologie, Dispute of Justification, *&c.* Twenty years ago, or near; I have at large Opened it in a Folio (*Cathol. Theol.*) which you saw, yea, in the *very* part which you take Notice of; and now you publish it [*worth the Noting, that I did not also in one sheet of Paper*, Printed the other day against a Calumnie of some Sectarian Hearers, who gave me no Occasion for such a work. Had it not been a Vanity of me, Should I in that sheet again have repeated, how I and the Papists differ about Justification? Were you bound to have read it in that sheet, any more than in many former Volumns? It's no matter for me; But I seriously beseech you, be hereafter more sober and just, than to deal with your Brethren, the Church and Truth, in such a manner as this! But by this Talk I suspect, that you will accuse me more for opening no more of the Difference in this Book. But,

1. It is enough for to open *my own Meaning*, and I am not obliged to open other Mens: And my own I have opened by so many Repetitions, in so many Books, as nothing but such Mens *Importunity and obstructed* Minds, could have Excused.

2. The

2. The Papists minds sure, may be better known by their own Writings, than by mine: The Council of *Trent*, telleth it you: What need I recite it? 3. I tell you again, as I did in my Confession, that I had rather all the Papists in the World agreed with us, than disagreed: I like a Doctrine the *better*, and not the worse, because all the Christian World consenteth to it. I am not ambitious to have a *Religion to my self*, which a Papist doth not own. Where they differ, I am sorry for it: And it pleaseth me better, to find in any Point that we are agreed, than that we differ. Neither you, nor any such as you, by crying [*O Popish! Antichristian!*] shall tempt me to do by the Papists, as the *Dominicans*, and *Jansenists*, and some *Oratorians*, do by the *Calvinists:* I will not with *Alvarez*, *Arnoldus*, *Gibieuf*, &c. make the World believe, that my Adversaries are much further from me than they are, for fear of being censured by Faction, to be one of them. If I would have been of a Church-Faction, and sold my Soul to please a Party, I would have begun before now, and taken a bigger Price for it, than you can offer me if you would.

Pag, 17. You say, [*Pile one Distinction or Evasion on another, as long as you please; as many several Faiths, and Works, and Justifications, as you can name, all this will never make two Poles meet*].

Answ. And do you cry out for *War* in the Darkness of Confusion, as long as you will, you shall never tempt me by it to renounce my Baptism, and List my self under the grand Enemy of *Love and Concord*, nor to Preach up *Hatred* and *Division* for

for nothing, as in the Name of Christ. If you will handle such Controversies, without *Distinguishing* of *Faiths*, *Works*, and *Justifications*, I will never perswade any Friend of mine to be your Pupil, or Disciple. Then *Simon Magus*'s faith, and the Devils *faith*, and *Peters* faith must all pass for the same, and justifie accordingly. Then indeed, Believing in God the Father, and the Holy Ghost, yea, and Christ, as our Teacher, King and Judg, *&c.* must pass for the *Works* by which no Man is Justified! If *Distinction* be *unsound*, detect the Error of it: If not, it is no Honour to a disputing Doctor to reproach it.

§. X. But *pag.*17. you set upon your great *undeceiving* Work; to shew the evil of *ill using Words*: [*Words* (you say) *as they are enfranchised into Language, are but the Agents and Factors of things, for which they continually negotiate with our Minds, conveying Errands on all occasions*, &c. (Let them mark, that charge the vanity and bombast of Metaphors on others, one word [*Signa*] should have served our turn instead of all this). [*Whence it follows, that their use and signification is Unalterable; but by the stamp of the like publick usage and imposition from whence at first they received their being*, &c.]

Answ. O Juniors, Will not such deceiving Words save you from my Deceits? But, 1. Is there a *Law*, and unalterable Law for the sense of Words? Indeed, the Words of the sacred Text must have no new Sense put upon them. 2. Are you sure that it was *Publick usage*, and *Imposition from* whence they first received their being? How shall we know

that they grew not into publick use from one Mans first Invention, except those that (not *Publick use*, but) *God Himself* made? 3. Are you sure that all or most Words now, *Latine* or *English*, have the same, and only the same use or sense, as was put upon them at the first? Is the change of the sense of Words a strange thing to us? 4. But that which concerneth our Case most, is, Whether there be many Words either of *Hebrew* and *Greek* in the Scripture, or of *Latine*, *English*, or any common Language, which have not *many Significations?* Your Reputation forbids you to deny it. And should not those many Significations be distinguished as there is Cause? Are not *Faith*, *Works*, *Just*, *Justice*, *Justification*, words of divers senses in the Scripture? and do not common Writers and Speakers use them yet more variously? And shall a Disputer take on him, that the *use* or *signification* of each is but *one*, or *two*, or is so *fixed* that there needeth no distinction? 5. Is the change that is made in all Languages in the World, made by the same publick usage and imposition, from which at first they received their being? 6. If (as you say) the *same thing can be represented by different words, only when they are Synonymous*, should we not avoid seeming to represent the same by *Equivocals*, which unexplained are unfit for it?

Pag. 20. You tell me what *sad work* you are doing; and no wonder, Sin and Passions are self-troubling things: And it's well if it be sad to your self alone, and not to such as you tempt into Mistakes, Hatred, and Division. It should be sad to every Christian, to see and hear those whom they

are

are bound to Love, represented as *odious:* And you are still, *pag.* 19. feigning, that [*Every eye may see Men dealing Blows and Deaths about, and therefore we are not wise if we think them agreed.*

But *doubtless*, many that seem killed by such Blows as some of yours, are still alive? And many a one is in Heaven, that by Divines pretending to be Orthodox, were damned on Earth! And many Men are more agreed than they were aware of. I have known a Knavish Fellow set two Persons of quality on Fighting, before they spake a word to one another, by telling them secretly and falsly what one said against the other. Many differ, even to persecuting and bloodshed, by *Will* and *Passion* and *Practice*, upon a falsly supposed great *difference in Judgment*. I will not so suddenly repeat what Proof I have given of some of this in the place you noted, *Cath. Theol. Confer.* 11, 12, & 13. There is more skill required to *narrow* differences, than to *widen* them; and to *reconcile*, than to *divide*; as there is to *quench* a Fire, than to *kindle* it; to *build*, than to *pull down*; to *heal*, than to *wound*.

I presume therefore to repeat aloud my contrary Cautions to your Juniors.

Young-Men, after long sad Experience of the sinful and miserable Contentions of the Clergie, and consequently of the Christian World, that you may escape the Guilt, I beseech you, whoever contradicteth it, consider and believe these following Notices: 1. *That all Words are but arbitrary Signs, and are changed as Men please; and through the Penury of them, and Mans imperfection in the Art of Speak-*

ing, there are very few at all, that have not various Significations.

2. *That this Speaking-Art requireth so much time and study, and all Men are so defective in it, and the variety of Mens skill in it is so very great, that no Men in the World do perfectly agree in their interpretation and use of Words.* The doleful plague of the Confusion of Tongues, doth still hinder our full Communication, and maketh it hard for us to understand Words our selves, or to be understood by others; for *Words* must have a three-fold aptitude of Signification. 1. To *signifie* the *Matter*, 2. And the *Speakers conceptions* of it. 3. And this as adapted to the hearers Mind, to make a true Impression there.

3. That God in Mercy hath not made *Words* so necessary as *Things*, nor necessary but for the sake of the *Things:* If *God*, *Christ*, *Grace*, and *Heaven*, be known, believed, and duly accepted, you shall be saved by what Words soever it be brought to pass.

4. Therefore *Real Fundamentals*, or *Necessaries to Salvation*, are more easily defined than *Verbal ones:* For *more* or *fewer* Words, *these* or *other* Words are needful to help *some* Persons, to Faith, and *Love*, and *Holiness*, as their Capacities are different.

5. But as he that truly *believeth in*, and *giveth up* himself to God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, according to the sense of the Baptismal Covenant, is a true Christian, to be loved, and shall be saved; so he that understandeth *such Words*, as help him to that true *Faith* and *Consent*, doth know so much of the *Verbal part*, as is of necessity

ceſſity to his Chriſtianity and Salvation.

6. *And he that is ſuch, holdeth no Hereſie or Error inconſiſtent with it: If he truly love God, it's a contradiction to ſay, that he holdeth an Error inconſiſtent with the Love of God.*

7. *Therefore ſee that you Love all ſuch as Chriſtians, till ſome proved or notorious inconſiſtents nullifying his Profeſſion diſoblige you.*

8. *Take your ſelves to be neither of Roman, or any other Church as Univerſal, which is leſs than the Univerſality of all Chriſtians headed by Chriſt alone.*

9. *Make this Love of all Chriſtians the ſecond part of your Religion, and the Love of God, of Chriſt, of Holineſs and Heaven, the firſt; and live thus in the ſerious practice of your Covenant, even of Simple Chriſtianity: For it's this that will be your Peace, in Life and at Death.*

10. *And if Men of various degrees of Learning* (or Speaking-skill) *and of various degrees of Holineſs, Humility, and Love, ſhall quarrel about* Words, *and forms of* Speech, *and ſhall hereticate, and revile, and damn each other, while the Eſſentials are held faſt and practiſed, diſcern Right from Wrong as well as you can; but take heed that none of them make* Words *a* ſnare, *to draw you injuriouſly to think hatefully of your Brother, or to divide the Churches, or Servants of Chriſt: And ſuſpect ſuch a Snare becauſe of the great ambiguity of Words, and imperfection of Mans Skill and Honeſty in all Matters of debate: And never diſpute ſeriouſly, without firſt agreeing of the Senſe of every doubtful term with him that you Diſpute with*].

Dr. *Tully*'s Allarm, and other Mens militant Courſe, perſwaded me as a Preſervative, to commend this Counſel to you.

§. XI. *Pag.* 19. You next very juſty commend *Method*, *ordering*, and *expreſſing* our *Conceptions*, *of which* (you ſay) *I ſeem to make little account* in *Compariſon*].

Anſw. 1. Had you ſaid, that I had been unhappy in my Endeavours, your Authority might have gone for Proof with many: But you could ſcarce have ſpoken a more incredible word of *me*, than that I ſeem to make little account of Method, I look for no ſharper Cenſure from the Theological Tribe, than that I *Over-do in my Endeavours after Method.* You ſhall not tempt me here unſeaſonably, to anticipate what Evidence I have to produce for my acquittance from this Accuſation.

2. But yet I will ſtill ſay, that it is not ſo neceſſary either to Salvation, or to the Churches Peace, that we all agree in *Methods and Expreſſions*, as that we agree in the hearty reception of Chriſt, and obedience to His Commands? So much Method all muſt know, as to know the *Beginning* and the *End*, from the *Effects* and *Means*, God from the Creature, and as our true conſent to the Baptiſmal Covenant doth require; and I will thankfully uſe all the help which you give me to go further: But I never yet ſaw that Scheme of Theologie, or of any of its Heads, which was any whit large, (and I have ſeen many) which was ſo exact in *Order*, as that it was dangerous in any thing to forſake it. But I cannot think meet to talk much of *Method*, with a Man that talketh as you do

do of *Distinguishing*, and handleth the Doctrine of Justification no more Methodically than you do.

§. XII. But *pag.* 19. you instance in the difference between Protestants and Papists, about the *Necessity of Good works, which is wide in respect of the placing or ranking of them*, viz. *The one stretching it to the first Justification, the other not, but confining it to its proper rank and province of Inherent Holiness, where it ought to keep*].

Answ. Wonderful! Have you that have so loudly called to me to tell how I differ about Justification, brought your own, and as you say, the Protestants difference to this? Will none of your Readers see now, who cometh nearer them, you or I?

1. Is this distinction our proof of your accurateness in *Method*, and *Order*, and *Expression?* What meaneth a distinction between [*First-Justification,*] and [*Inherent Holiness*]? Do you difference them *Quoad ordinem*, as *First* and *Second?* But here is no *Second* mentioned: Is it in the nature of the things [*Justification*, and *Inherent Holiness*]? What signifieth the [*First*] then? But Sir, how many Readers do you expect who know not, 1. That it is not to the *First Justification* at all, but to that which they call the *Second* or *Increase*, that the Church of *Rome* asserteth the necessity or use of Mans meritorious *Works?* See what I have fully cited out of them for this, *Cath. Theol. Lib.* 2. *Confer.* 13. *pag.* 267. *&c.* saving that some of them are for such *Preparatives* as some call *Merit of Congruity*, and as our English

Divines do constantly preach for, and the Synod of *Dort* at large assert; though they disown the *name of Merit*, as many of the *Papists* do. They ordinarily say with *Austine*, *Bona opera sequuntur Justificatum, non præcedunt Justificandum.*

2. But, I hope, the word [*First*] here overslipt your your Pen, instead of [*Second*]: But suppose it did so: What's the difference between *the Papists first* or *second Justification*, and the *Protestants Inherent Holiness?* None that ever I heard or read of: Who knoweth not that the *Papists* take *Justification* for *Inherent Holiness?* And is this the great difference between *Papists* and *Protestants*, which I am so loudly accused for not acknowledging? viz. *The Papists place Good-Works before Justification*, that is, *Inherent Holiness*; and the *Protestants more rightly place them before Inherent Holiness?* Are you serious, or do you prevaricate?

The *Papists* and *Protestants* hold, that there are some *Duties and common Grace*, usually *preparatory* to Conversion (or Sanctification); which some *Papists (de nomine)* call *Merit* of *Congruity*, and some will not. The *Papists* and *Protestants* say, that *Faith* is in order of nature, at least, before that *Habitual Love*, which is called *Holiness*, and before the *Works thereof*. The *Papists* and *Protestants* say, that *Works of Love* and *Obedience*, follow our First Sanctification, and make up but the *Second part of it*, which consisteth in the *Works of Holiness*. If you speak not of *Works* in the same sense in each part of your Assignation, the Equivocation would be too gross, *viz.* If you should mean [*Papists rank* the *necessity of preparatory Common Works*, or the *Internal act of Faith, or Love, stretching it*

to

to the First Justification; and *Protestants rank other Works*, viz. *The fruits* of *Faith* and *Love*, with *Inherent Holiness*. All agree, 1. That *Common Works go* before *Sanctification*. 2. That Internal Love, and other Grace, do *constitute* Sanctification in the First part of it. 3. That *Special Works* proceeding from *Inward Grace*, are the effects of the First *Part*, and the constitutive Causes of the Second Part of Sanctification; as the word extendeth also to *Holiness of Life:* And whilst *Papists* take *Justification* for *Sanctification*, in all this there is *De re* no difference. (But your accurate Explications by such terms, as [*Stretching*, *Confirming*, *Province*, &c.] are fitter for *Tully*, than for *Aristotle*).

And is this it in the Application that your Zeal will warn Men of, that we must in this take heed of joyning with the *Papists?* Do you mean [*Rank Good-Works with Inherent Holiness*, and not with *the First Sanctification*, and *you then* do *widely differ from the Papists*]? Will not your Reader say, 1. What doth *Inherent Holiness differ from* the First *Sanctification?* 2. *Do you not invite* me *thus herein to be a Papist*, when they rank them no where but, as you say, the *Protestants* do? 3. Do not you here proclaim, that *Papists* and *Protestants* differ not about the necessity of Good-works to Justification? But yet I that would make no Differences wider than they are, can find some greater than you have mentioned.

Truly Sir, I am grieved and ashamed, to foresee how Learned *Papists* will make merry with such Passages; and say, *See here how we differ from the Protestants! See what it is for*, that the *Protestant*

ſtant Doctors ſeparate from the Church of Rome! viz. *Becauſe we make Good-Works neceſſary to the Firſt Juſtification, which unleſs equivocally ſpoken, is falſe; and becauſe the Proteſtants rank them with Inherent Holineſs, as we do*]. What greater advantage will they deſire againſt us, than to chooſe us ſuch Advocates? And to ſhew the World that even where their keeneſt Adverſaries condemn them, and draw Men from them, they do but juſtifie them? Who knoweth what a Temptation they may make of ſuch paſſages to draw any to Popery? It is my aſſurance, that ſuch *Over-doing*, is *Undoing*; and that miſtaken Accuſations of the *Papiſts* greatly advantage them againſt us, which maketh me the more againſt ſuch Dealing; beſides the *ſinfulneſs*, of pretending that any differences among Chriſtians, are greater than indeed they are.

But may not I think that you take the word [*Juſtification*] here in the *Proteſtant Senſe*, and not in the *Papiſts*, when you ſay that they *rank Good-work's-neceſſity as ſtretcht to the Firſt Juſtification?* No ſure: For, 1. Proteſtants uſe not to diſtingniſh of a *Firſt* and *Second* Juſtification, which Papiſts do, but of Juſtification as *Begun, Continued, and Conſummate*. 2. If it were ſo, it were not true: For the Firſt *Juſtification* in the Proteſtant Senſe, is our *firſt right* to *Impunity* and *Life Eternal, freely given to Believers, for the Merits of Chriſts perfect Righteouſneſs and Satisfaction*. And Papiſts do not make *Good-works* (unleſs Equivocally ſo called) neceſſary to this; but as a Fruit to follow it.

As

As for *Remiſſion of Sin*, I have elſe-where proved, 1. That moſt commonly by that word the Papiſts mean nothing, but that which we call *Mortification*, or Putting away, or deſtroying the Sin it ſelf, as to the habit and ceaſing the Act. 2. That moſt of them are not reſolved, where the *Remiſſion* of the *Puniſhment* (which Proteſtants call *Remiſſion of Sin*, or *Forgiveneſs*) ſhall be placed: They differ not much as to its *Time*, but whether it be to be called any *part of Juſtification*: Some ſay, yea; ſome make it a *diſtinct thing*. Moſt deſcribe *Juſtification* by it ſelf, as conſiſting in our *Remiſſion* of, or Deliverance from Sin it ſelf, and the infuſed habit of Love or Righteouſneſs (all which we call Sanctification), and the *forgiveneſs of the Penalty* by it ſelf, not medling with the Queſtion, whether the latter be any part of the former; ſo much are they at a loſs in the Notional part among themſelves. But they (and we) diſtinguiſh of *Forgiveneſs*, as we diſtinguiſh of Penalties: We have a right to Impunity as to everlaſting Damnation, upon our firſt being Juſtified; but our Right becometh afterward more *full*, and many other Penalties are after to be remitted.

§. XIII. *Pag.* 20. In my 42. *Direct.* for the Cure of Church-diviſions, telling the Weak whom they muſt follow, I concluded, 1. *That the neceſſary Articles of Faith muſt be made our own, and not taken meerly on the authority of any; and we muſt in all ſuch things of abſolute neceſſity keep company with the Univerſal Church.* 2. *That in Matters of Peace and Concord the greater part muſt be our Guide.* 3. *That in Matters of humane Obedience,*

our

our Governours must be our Guides. And, 4. *In Matters of high and difficult Speculation, the judgment of one Man of extraordinary Understanding and Clearness, is to be preferred before the Rulers and the major Vote. I instanced in Law, Philosophy, Physick, Languages*, &c. *and in the Controversies of the Object of Predestination, the nature of the Will's Liberty, Divine Concourse, the determining way of Grace, of the definition of Justification, Faith*, &c.] Here I was *intreated before God and my Conscience, to search my self, with what Design or Intent I wrote this*, and to tell you, *Who that One is, that we may know whom to prefer, and to whom, in the Doctrine of Justification*, &c.

Answ. How greatly do you dishonour your self, (and then you will impute it to me) by insisting on such palpably abusive Passages? Had you not been better, have silently past it by? 1. Doth not the World know, that Heathens and Christians, Papists and Protestants, are Agreed on this general Rule? 2. And will you make any believe that *Definition* of *Justification* is none of these *Works* of *Art*, which depend on humane Skill? How then came you to be so much better at it than I? I find not that you ascribe it to any *special Revelation* which you *have*. And if you should ascribe it to *Piety*, and say, *Hoc non est Artis, sed Pietatis opus:* I would go to many a good Woman before you. Nor do you plead general Councils, nor the Authority of the Church. 3. And what sober Scholar will you make believe, that by laying down this common Rule, I signifie some *One singular Person*, as an *Individuum determinatum*, whom

whom therefore I must acquaint you with? These things are below a Grave Divine.

Pag. 21. Where you *called me to seriousness* or *diligence* in my *search*, and I told *you* by what, and how many Writings, I have manifested my almost thirty years *Diligence* in this Controversie, and that I am now grown past more *serious* and *diligent* Studies; that I might shew you what a trifling way it is, for a Man to wrangle with him that hath written so many things, to tell the World what his studies of this Point have been, and never to touch them, but to call him a-*new* to *serious* diligence: You now expostulate with me, whether you *accused* me *for want of diligence?* I talk not of *Accusing*, but I tell you, that I have done my best; and that it were a poor kind of dealing with your self, if you had written against many, as you have done against me twenty five years ago, and very often, if instead of taking any notice of your Labours, I should call you now to diligent Studies.

As for your Lesson, *pag.* 22. that *tumbling over many Books without meditation, may breed but Crudities*, &c. It is very true, and the calamity of too many of the literate Tribe, who think that they have deserved Credit and Reverence, when they say the words which others, whom they would be joyned with, have said before them: Want of good Digestion is a common Disease of many that never complain of it, nor feel any present trouble by it.

Pag. 22, 23. You insinuate that about *Retractation*, which I before detected: I told you when, and where, I *Suspended* or *Retracted* the Book,

and

and for what Reasons, and you presently feign a Retractation of the Doctrine, and *of about sixty Books* of Retractions.

It's well that *pag.* 23. you had the justice not to justifie your [*Nec dubito quin imputatam Christi justitiam incluserit*]; But to confess your Injustice, was too much: It is not your *own Retractation* that you are for, it seems.

§. XIV. *Pag.* 23, 24. You talk as if my supposing that both [*Justice*] and [*Imputation*], are capable of Definitions which are not the Things, were a Fallacy, because [*or*] is a disjunctive; *viz.* When I say that the *Definition* of the *one*, *or* the *other*, is not the *Thing*. Do you grant it of them Disjunctively, and yet maintain the contrary of them Conjunct? Yes, you say, [*Imputed Justice cannot differ from its true definition, unless you will have it to differ really from it self*]. And, *pag.* 34. you say, [*I am ashamed you should thus over and over expose your self—— as if supposing* (Definitions) *true, they were not the same* Re, *with the* Definitum.—— *Good Sir, talk what you please in private, to such as understand not what you say, and let them give* you a *grand* Σοφὰς *for your pains; but you may do well to use more Civility to the reason of a Scholar, though he hath not yet worn out his Freshmans Gown*].

Answ. This is no light or jesting Matter: The comfort of Souls dependeth on it. I see some Men expect that *Reverence of their Scholarship* should give them great advantage: But if one argued thus with me for Transubstantiation, I would not turn to him, to escape the Guilt of *Incivility*.

If

If the *Definition*, and the *Definitum*, as in question now, *be the same Thing*, wo to all the Unlearned World, and wo to all Freshmen, that yet have not learnt well to define; and wo to all Divines that differ in their Definitions, except those that are in the right.

I know that a *Word* and a *Mental Conception*, are not *Nothing:* They may be called *Things*, but when we distinguish the *Things* from their *Signs*, *Names*, or *Definitions*, we take not the word [*Things*] so laxly, as to comprehend the said *Signs*, *Names*, &c. When we say, that the *Thing defined* is *necessary*, but to be able *to Define it*, or actually to *Define it*, is not necessary (to Salvation) it is notorious that we take *Definition* (as *Defining*) *actively*, as it is *Actus definientis*; and *Definire* sure is not the same with the *Thing defined*. I have heard before your Letter told me, that *Definitum & definitio idem sunt:* But, I pray you, let us not quibble almost all the World under a sentence of Damnation. As long ago as it is since I read such words, I remember our Masters told us, (I think *Schibler* in his *Topicks* for one) that when they are taken *Pro terminis Logicis definitio & definitum non sunt idem*; but only when they are taken *Pro rebus per eos terminos significatis*; and that there they differ in *Modo significandi essentiam*, the *definitum signifying* the *Essence confusedly*, and the *Definition distinctly*. If you will take the *Res definita*, for that which is strictly nothing but *Rei conceptus inadæquatus seu partialis*, (that is, a *Species*) and that not as the *thing* is *Existent extra intellectum*, but as the conception is an operation of the Mind, so I confess, that he that hath a *true Conception* of

a

a *Species* as *meerly denominated*, or *as defined*, hath *the same conception* of it: And also the *Thing named*, and the *Thing defined*, is the *same thing in it self*. *Homo & Animal rationale*, are the same; that is, it is the *same essence*, which is *denominated Homo*, and *defined Animal rationale*. And it is the same *Conceptus mentis*, which we have (if true) when we *denominate*, and when we *define*. But as *Things* are distinct from the *knowledg and signs* of Things, nothing is *Res*, that is not *existent*; and nothing *existeth* but in *Singulars* (or *Individuals*): And as nothing can be defined but a *Species*, so a *Species*, or any *Universal*, is *nothing* but a *Notion*, or *Ens rationis*, save as it *existeth* in the said *Individuals*. And in the *Individuals*, it is nothing but *their being* as *partially*, or *inadequatly taken*, or a *Conceptus objectivus partialis*, (whether it be of a thing *really*, or only *intellectually* partible, or any thing which our narrow Minds cannot conceive of, *Uno & simplici conceptu activo*). Now if you take the word [*Definition*] for the *Species*, as *existent in Individuals*, it is *really a part* of the thing; that is, a *Partial objective conceptus*, or somewhat of the *Thing* as *Intelligible*: But this is to take [*Definition*] in *Sensu passivo*, for the Thing defined; which our Case distinguisheth.

But Sir, I crave your leave, to distinguish *Real objective Beings*, from, 1. The *Knowledg*. 2. and the Names, and other Logical Organs, by which we *know* them, and *express* our knowledg of them: God, Christ, Grace, Glory, Pardon, Justification, Sanctification, the Gospel-Doctrine, Precept, Promises, Faith, Hope, Love, Obedience, Humility, Patience, &c. are the *Res definitæ* in

In our *Case*, not as they are *in esse cognito*, or in the notion or idea of them, but *in esse reali*. To *Define* properly, is either, 1. *Mentally* to *conceive* of these things; 2. or *Expressively*, to signifie such *Conceptions*, agreeably to the nature of the things *known*, or *Expressively defined*: Which is, if the Definition be perfect, under the notions of a *Genus*, and *Differentia*. The Definition as in *Words*, is but a *Logical Organ*, (as *Names* are also *Notifying signs*): *Mental defining*, is but the said *distinct knowledg* of the thing defined, and is neither *really* the *Thing it self*, nor usually of necessity to the Thing: Which two, I shall prove distinctly as to the sense of our Case.

1. The Definition of Justification, is either our *Distinct knowledg*, or *Expression* of it: Justification is not our *Distinct knowledg*, or *Expression* of it: Therefore the Definition of Justification, and Justification, are not the same.

Justification *In sensu activo*, is not an Act of God, and *In sensu passivo*, is the Relative state of Man thereby effected: But the Definition of Justification is neither.

The Definition of Justification, is a work of Art; but Justification is a Work of Grace.

A wicked damnable Man, or a damned Devil, may *define* Justification, and so have the *Definition* of it; but not Justification it self.

The Definition of Justification, Faith, Love, *&c.* is *Quid Logicum*; but *Justification*, *Faith*, *Love*, &c. are things *Physical* and *Moral*.

A Man is Justified (or hath Christs Righteousness imputed to him) in his sleep, and when he think-

eth not of it; but he hath not the Active *definition* of Justification in his sleep, *&c.*

Other things be not the same Really with their Definition, therefore neither is *Justification*, *Faith*, &c.

The Sun is not really the same thing with a Definition of the Sun; nor Light, Heat, Motion, *&c.* A Brute can see, taste, feel, smell, that cannot define them. If you have a Bishoprick, because you *define* a Bishoprick, or have a Lordship, a Kingdom, Health, *&c.* because you can define them, your Axiome hath stood you in good stead.

The Definition is but *Explicatio rei*: But *Rei explicatio non est ipsa res.*

Individuals (say most) are not *Definable*: But nothing is truly *Res*, but Individuals. *Universals* as they are *in the Mind*, are *existent Individual Acts*, *Cogitations*, *Notions*: As they are *out of the Mind*, they are *nothing* but *Individuorum quid intelligibile.*

The Definition of Learning, of a Doctor, *&c.* may be got in a day: If Learning and Doctorship may be so, what useless things are Universities and Books?

Perswade a hungry Scholar, that he hath Meat and Drink; or the Ambitious, that he hath Preferment; or the Covetous, or Poor, that he hath Money, because he hath in his Mind, or Mouth, the *Definition* of it; and quibble him into satisfaction by telling him, that *Definitio & definitum sunt idem re.* We *know* and *express* things *narrowly* by *Names*, and *largely* and *distinctly* by *Definitions*: The *Definition* here, is *Explicatio nominis*, (as *Animal*

mal rationale, of the *name Homo*); and both *Name* and *Definition*, as they are *Verba mentis vel oris*, or *Verborum significatio*, are surely divers from the things *named* and *defined*, known and expressed; unless by the *Thing* you mean only the *Knowledg*, or *Notion* of the Thing.

Therefore though *Cui competit definitio eidem quoq; competit definitum, & contra, & quod convenit definitioni convenit definito:* Yet say not that *Imputed Righteousness in Re*, is the same with the *Definition*, as it is the *Definers* act.

By this time you have helpt Men to understand by an Instance, why St. *Paul* so much warneth Christians to take heed lest any deceive them by vain Philosophy, even by Sophistry, and abused arbitrary Notions.

Remember, Sir, that our Case is of grand Importance; As it is stated in my *Direct.* 42. which you assaulted; it is [*Whether if the Question were of the Object of Predestination, of the nature of the Will's liberty, Divine concourse*, and *determining way of Grace, of the Definition of Justification, Faith*, &c. *a few well studied Divines are not here to be preferred before Authority, and the major Vote.* Such are my words. I assert, 1. That the *Defining of Justification, Faith*, &c. is a work of Art. 2. And I have many and many times told the World (which you seem to strike at) that Christians do not differ so much in their *Real conceptions* of the *Matter*, as they do in their *Definitions*. 1. Because *Definitions* are made up of *Ambiguous words*, whose Explication they are not agreed in; and almost all Words are ambiguous till explained; and ambiguous Words are not fit to define, or

be defined, till explained. And, 2. Becauſe both ſelecting fit terms, and explaining them, and ordering them, are works of Art, in which Men are unequal; and there is as great variety of Intellectual Conceptions, as of Faces. 3. And I have often ſaid, That a *Knowledg intuitive*, or a *Simple apprehenſion* of a thing as *Senſate*, or an *Internal experience*, or *Reflect act*, and a general notion of ſome things, may prove the truth of Grace, and ſave Souls, and make us capable of Chriſtian Love and Communion, as being true ſaving Knowledg. 4. And conſequently I have often ſaid, that many a thouſand Chriſtians have *Faith*, *Hope*, *Deſire*, *Love*, *Humility*, *Obedience*, *Juſtification*, *Adoption*, *Union with Chriſt*, who can *define* none of theſe: Unleſs you will ſpeak equivocally of *Definition* it ſelf, and ſay as good *Melanchon*, and as *Gutberleth*, and ſome other Romiſts, that *Notitia intuitiva eſt definitio*, who yet ſay but what I am ſaying, when they add, [*Vel ſaltem inſtar definitionis*]. If all are without *Faith*, *Love*, *Juſtification*, *Adoption*, who cannot give a true Definition of them, how few will be ſaved? How much more then doth *Learning* to Mens ſalvation, than Grace? And *Ariſtotle* then is not ſo far below *Paul*, or the Spirit of Chriſt, as we (juſtly) believe.

The Caſe is ſo weighty and palpable, that you have nothing to ſay; but as you did about the Guilt of our nearer Parents ſins, to yield all the Cauſe, and with a paſſionate clamour to tell Men that I miſtake you, or wreſt your words; of which I ſhall appeal to every ſober Reader, that will peruſe the words of mine which you aſſault, and yours as

as they are an Answer to mine.

In a word, you go about by the abuse of a trivial *Axiome* of *Definitions*, 1. To sentence most Christians to Hell, and cast them into Desperation, as wanting the Grace which they cannot define. 2. And to destroy Christian Love and Concord, and tear the Church into as many Shreds, as there be diversities of Definitions used by them. 3. And you would tempt us to think much hardlier of your self, than we must or will do; as if your *Faith*, *Justification*, &c. were unsound, because your Definitions are so.

I know that *Unius rei una tantum est Definitio*, speaking, 1. Not of the *Terms*, but the *Sense*. 2. And supposing that *Definition* to be perfectly true; that is, the *truth* of *Intellection* and *Expression* consisting in their congruity to the *Thing*; while the *thing* is *one* and the same, the *conception* and *expression* which is perfectly true, must be so too. But, 1. Our *understandings* are all imperfect, and we know *nothing* perfectly but *Secundum quædam*; and *Zanchez* saith truly, that *Nihil scitur*, if we call that only *Knowledg* which is *perfect*: And consequently no *Mental Definition* is perfect. 2. And *Imperfections* have many degrees. 3. And our *Terms*, which make up that which you know I called a *Definition* in my *Dir.* 42. (as it is in words) are as aforesaid, *various*, *mutable*, and variously understood and used.

§. XV. *Pag.* 24. Again you are at it, [*Whom do you mean by that one rare Person, whose single Judgment is to be preferred in the point of Justification, and to whom*].

Answ. 1. No one that knoweth not the difference between an *Invididuum vagum & determinatum.* 2. No one that is of so hard Metal, as in despite of the plainest words, to insinuate to the World, that these words [*A few well-studied Judicious Divines*] do signifie only one; and that these words [*One Man of extraordinary understanding* and *clearness*], (*is to be preferred before the Rulers* and *major Vote, in difficult speculations*) do signifie *one individuum determinatum* in the World, and that the Speaker is bound to name the Man. No one that thinketh that *Pemble*, who in his *Vind. Grat.* hath almost the very same words, said well, and that I who repeat them, am as criminal as you pretend: No one who either knoweth not, that almost all the World (even Papists) agree in this Rule, or that thinketh his judgment fit herein to bear them all down: No one who, when his abuses are brought into the open Sun-shine, will rather accuse the Light than repent.

But, *pag.* 25. After some words to jeer away Conviction, you tell me, [*We must have some better account of you*, quem quibus, *than what you have given us yet. I shall take leave to present our indifferent Readers with a more ingenuous and truer state of the Question, far more suitable both to my plain meaning and the clear purport of your Direction. Let the Case be this: There is One who of late hath raised much dust among us, about the grand Article of Justification; Whether it be by Faith without Works, or by Faith and Works too? All our old Renowned Divines on this side and beyond the Seas are unanimously agreed, that Justification is by Faith alone*, i. e. *without Works. This one Person hath*

hath often publiſhed his Judgment to the contrary —— ſo that a poor Academical Doctor may very rationally enquire of you, Who in this caſe is to be preferred? That one, or thoſe many?

Anſw. There was a Diſputant who would undertake to conquer any Adverſary: When he was asked, *How?* He ſaid he would pour out upon him ſo many and ſo groſs untruths, as ſhould leave him nothing to anſwer congruouſly, but a *Mentiris*; and then all the World would judg him uncivil, and condemn him for giving ſuch an unreverent anſwer. But you ſhall not ſo prevail with me, but I will call your Reader to anſwer theſe Queſtions:

1. Whether it be any truer, that [*This is the clear purport of my Direction*], than it is that I ſay, *There is but one Star* in the Firmament, becauſe I ſay that *one Star is more Luminous than many Candles?*

2. Whether if a diſeaſed Reader will put ſuch a Senſe upon my words, his Forgery be a true *ſtating* of the Queſtion between him and me, with out my conſent?

3. Whether an intimation that this ONE is either *Unicus*, or *Primus*, or *Singular*, in the definition of Juſtification, or the interceſt of Works, be any truer, than that he is the only ejected Miniſter in *England*, While the writings of *Bucer*, *Ludov. Crocius*, *Joh. Bergius*, *Conrad. Bergius*, *Calixtus*, *Placeus*, *le Blank*, *Dave. Gatak. Wott. Preſt. Ball*, and multitudes ſuch are viſible ſtill among us?

4. Whether he deals *truly*, *wiſely*, or *friendly* with the holy Scripures, and the Proteſtants, who would perſwade the Ignorant, that this is the true ſtate of the Controverſie, [*Whether it be by Faith without Works, or by Faith and Works too, that we*

are justified] While the Scripture speaketh *both*, and all Protestants hold both in several senses? And whether this easie stating of Controversies, without more Explication or Distinction, be worthy an Academical Disputant?

5. Whether it be true or notoriously false, that [*All our Renowned Divines on this side, and beyond the Seas, are agreed*], of that in this Question of the interest of Works, which this one contradicteth?

6. Whether this Doctors naked Affirmation hereof be better proof, than that *one* Mans citation of the words of above an Hundred (yea many Hundred) as giving as much to Works as he doth, is of the contrary?

7. Whether it be an ingenuous way beseeming Academics, to talk at this rate, and assert such a stating of the Question and such consent, without one word of notice or mention of the Books, in which I state the Question, and bring all this evidence of consent?

8. If such a Doctor will needs enquire, whether the secret thoughts of the Writer meant *not himself*, when he pretendeth but to accuse the Rule there given, and should enquire but of the meaning of the words, whether it savour more of *Rationality*, or a presumptuous usurping the Prerogative of God?

§. XVI. *Pag.* 27. Though your approach be wrathful, you are constrained to come *nearer* yet, and you *cannot* deny my Rule of Direct. in other Points, but only those of [*High and difficult speculation*]: And, do you deny it there? You will

will deal with it but as the application of that Rule to the *Definition of Juſtification?* (And ſhall we loſe your favour, by forcing you to lay by your Oppoſition as to all the reſt?) But here you ſay you [*exceedingly differ from me*]; Or elſe you would be aſhamed of ſo much Combating in the dark: *Exceeding* oft ſignifieth ſome extream.

Your Reaſons are, 1. *You hold not the Doctrine of Juſtification to be properly of Speculative concern, but wholly Practical:* Where yet you confeſs, that in all *Practical knowledg, there be ſome antecedent contemplations of the Nature, Properties, End, Object,* and that to *know the certain number of Paces home-ward, is a Speculative nicety*].

Anſw. And can you find no fairer a ſhift for diſagreement? I would ſuch as you made not the Doctrine of Juſtification too little *Practical?* I am far from thinking that it is not Practical: But is not a *Logical definition* the opening the *Nature, Properties, End, Object*, or ſome of theſe which you call Contemplations? Make not plain things dark, Sir: The uſe of Art is not to ſhut the Windows, and confound Mens Minds. I take all *Theologie* to be together, *Scientia-affectiva-practica*; for our *Intellect, Will*, and *Practice*, muſt be poſſeſt or ruled by it: But it is firſt *Scientia*, and we muſt *know* before we can *will* and *practiſe*. And though all right knowledg tend to Practice, yet forgive me for telling you, that I think that many holy Perſons in Scripture and Primitive times, loved and practiſed more than you or I, who knew not how to form an exact Logical Definition. And that he that knoweth the things of the Spirit ſpiritually, by Scripture Notions, may practiſe them

as

as fully, as he that knoweth and ſpeaketh them in the Notions of *Ariſtotle*; or elſe the School-Men excel the Apoſtles. Though ambling be an eaſie Pace, which Horſes are taught by Gives and Fetters, it followeth not that a Horſe cannot travel as far in his natural pace. When you have ſaid all, *Logical defining* ſhall be a work of Art, and the *Church ſhould* not *be torn*, and *Souls ſhall not be damned*, for want of it. He that *Loveth*, *Believeth*, *Hopeth*, *Obeyeth*, and by *doing* them hath a reflecting perception what they are, and hath but ſuch a knowledg of the Goſpel as may be had without a proper Definition, ſhall be ſaved.

2. Pag. 28, 29. you ſay, [*Nor is the Doctrine of Juſtification ſo high and difficult, but that the meaneſt Chriſtian may underſtand it ſufficiently to Salvation, ſo far as words can make it intelligible*].

Anſw. Your own blows ſeem not to hurt you. I thank you for granting ſo much *hope* to the *meaneſt Chriſtians*. But what's this to your Caſe? 1. Do the meaneſt Chriſtians know how to *define* Juſtification, and all the Grace which they have? 2. Are they acquainted with all the [*Words that ſhould make it intelligible?*]

Pag. 29. you add, [*You have done little ſervice to your weaker Chriſtians to perſwade them otherwiſe (as well as to the great bleſſed Charter of Salvation) and to lead them out of the plain road into Woods and Mazes, to that one Man of extraordinary Judgment and Clearneſs; no body muſt know what his Name is, or where he dwells, and ſo to whirle them about till you have made them giddy*——].

Anſw. How eaſie is it to talk at this rate for any Cauſe in the World? Is this Diſputing or Reaſon-

foning? Cannot I as eaſily ſay thus againſt you? But the queſtion is of *Things viſible:* I willingly appeal to any intelligent impartial Divine, who will read what you and I have written of Juſtification, which of us it is that hath done more to bring Men *out of Woods and Mazes*, into the *plaineſt Road?* Let them, that have leiſure for no more, read but my *Preface to my Diſput. of Juſtif.* and mark which ſide wrongeth *weak Chriſtians*, and the *Charter of Salvation.*

§. XVII. Pag. 29. you add, [*Sir, I underſtand ſomething at theſe years, without your Tutorage, of the duty both of Paſtors and People: But I know not what you mean to make the way to Heaven (revealed ſufficiently to all, &c.) to be a matter of high abſtruſe Speculation, as if none but great Scholars, and Men of extraordinary Judgment, could by the right uſe of Scriptures, and other ordinary common means, be able to find it out, till they have met with that Elias, &c.*]

Anſw. Still I ſee we ſhall agree whether you will or not: O, Sir, it is juſt the contrary that I wrote for: And I need but repeat your words to anſwer you. I am not diſparaging your underſtanding, otherwiſe than you may ſo call the vindicating of needful truth: Nor did I ever preſume to offer you my Tutorage: You ſpeak all this with too much tenderneſs. But that which I have written almoſt all my Books of Controverſie againſt, is this *making the Way to Heaven more difficult* and bewildring, than the Scriptures make it. Therefore it is that I have perſwaded Men to lay leſs ſtreſs on arbitrary humane Notions: But the queſtion

ſtion is now, whether it be your *Courſe* or *mine*, that is guilty of this? Are *Logical Definitions* the *neceſſary Way to Heaven?* Doth the *Scripture* ſufficiently reveal ſuch *Definitions* to all? Do *all ordinary Believers* by the *uſe of the Scripture*, know how to *define?* Do not Logicians make true defining one of the ſureſt ſigns of *clear* and *accurate* knowledg? Why ſhould you and I diſpute thus about Matters of Fact? I know by the principles of Conformity, that your Judgment is not like to be *narrower* than *mine* about the ſtate of determinate Individuals: I ſuppoſe you would take as many to the *Lords Supper* as Believers, as I would, and *abſolve* as many, and *pronounce* as many *ſaved* at *Buryal*. Let you and I call but a dozen of the next Families together, and deſire every Man and Woman of them, to give you a Definition of Juſtification, (out of the hearing of the reſt) and if they all *give you a true definition*, and *one definition*, I will write a Retractation. I know you not; but by your now telling me, of your *underſtanding* of the duties of *Paſtors* and *People*, I may ſuppoſe that you *have been a Paſtour*, (elſe——). And if ſo, that you have had perſonal conference with *moſt* (if not *all*) of your Flock. If you have found them all ſuch *able concordant Definers of Juſtification*, you have had a more learned Flock than I had. I doubt your *Learned Scholars* could not do it, till they met with ſome ſuch *Elias* or *Ariſtotle*, as you! Yea, let us take only ſuch as by their Lives we commonly judg truly Godly Chriſtians: And if all *theſe* give you *one* and a *true* definition of Juſtification, then do you tell them that *Defining* is no ſuch difficult work, but ordinary Chriſtians

ſtians may and do attain it, and I that make it difficult, make the way to Heaven difficult, for Defining is the way to Heaven: But if not one of many Score or Hundred (till you teach them anew) do give you a *true* and the *ſame* Definition; I will go on and ſtill ſay, that *They wrong Souls, the Goſpel*, and *the Church, who pretend ſuch neceſſity and facility of defining*, and *will cenſure, reproach*, or damn all that agree not with them in a Definition, when they have as *real* though leſs *diſtinct* a knowledg of the thing.

I doubt not but you know how much difference there is among Learned Men about *Definitions* themſelves in general: Whether they belong to Metaphyſicks, Logicks, or Phyſicks? Whether *Definitio Phyſica* (as *Man* is defined *per Animam, Corpus & Unionem)* be a *proper Definition?* Whether a true *Logical* and *Phyſical* definition ſhould not be the ſame? Whether *Definitio objectiva* be properly called *Definitio*, or only *Formalis?* Whether *Accidents* may be properly defined? *An Genus definiri poſſit? An pars Logica definiri poſſit? An individua poſſint definiri? (Inquit* Hurtado, *Negari non poteſt Individuis definitio ſubſtantialis; & quidem eſſentialis Phyſice; eſt enim de eſſentia hujus hominis hæc anima cum hoc Corpore; Imo & eſſentialis Metaphyſice—— ſi individua recte poſſent penetrari, illorum definitio eſſet omnium perfectiſſima) An ea quæ differunt definitione diſtinguantur realiter?* With a multitude ſuch. And is the *Art of Defining* ſo *eaſie*, as that *ordinary Chriſtians ſalvation* muſt lie upon it, when ſo many things about Defining are among the ſubtileſt Doctors undetermined?

And

And as Ignorant as I am, while you suppose *me* unable to *define Justification*, I would wish you (not for my sake, but *theirs*) that you will not sentence all as unjustified to Damnation, that are not more skilful in defining than I, and that you will not reject all such from the Sacrament and Communion of the Church.

§. XVIII. Yet again, *pag.* 30. you tell me, [*I cannot well swallow down in the lump, what you would have me and others to do, when you direct us to prefer that one Man before the Rulers and majority of Votes, till you acquaint us who that Gentleman is, and what sort of Rulers and Majorities you mean*].

Answ. What you cannot swallow you must leave: I will not cram or drench you. I could wish for your own sake, that you had not thus often told the World of such a Malady, as that must needs be which hindreth your swallow: When, 1. You your self receive the same Rule in other Instances, and make all this stir against it only, as to the *Definition of Justification*, even the *Logical definition*, which is *Actus definientis*, called *Definitio formalis*, and not the *Definitio objectiva*, as the *Ipsum definitum* is by some improperly called. 2. And when the words in that Instance are not [*ONE MAN*] but [*a few Men*] which your Eyes may still see; and when in the *General* direction where *one Man* is mentioned, there is no such word as [*that one Man*], or the least intimation of an *Individuum determinatum*; You greatly wrong your Honour by such dealing; As you do by adding,

1. *For*

1. [*For the single Person (that Monarch in Divinity) to whom we are upon differences to make our Appeals*, &c.]

Answ. If you hold on thus to talk as in your sleep, and will not shut your Chamber-door, but commission the Press to report your words to the World, how can your best Friends secure your reputation? Is not all this talk of *single Person*, and *Monarch in Divinity*, and *Appeals*, the effects of a Dream, or somewhat worse? These *Fictions* will serve no honest ends. But you next come indeed to the true *difficulty of the Case*, and ask:

[*I beseech you Sir, how shall your ignorant or weaker Christian be able to judg of fitness?—— He had need to have a very competent measure of Abilities himself, who is to give his verdict of anothers*, &c.]

This is very true and rational: But it concerneth *you* as *much* as *me* to *answer* it, unless you will renounce the Rule. And seeing you grant it in other Instances, if you please to answer your own question as to those other, you have answered it as to this: And if you will not learn of your self, I am not so vain as to think, that you will learn of me.

In case of *Subtilties* which depend upon *Wit*, and *Art*, and *Industry*, in that proportion which few, even faithful Men attain, I remember but one of these ways that can be taken; Either wholly to *suspend* our *Judgments*, and not to meddle with them, till we can reach them our selves; Or to take them *fide humana*, or as *probabilities* on the Credit of some Men, rather than others: As to the first, I am for as much *suspension* of Judgment,

as

as will ſtand with the part of a Learner (where we muſt learn; and in uſeleſs things for a total ſuſpenſion). But where *Learning* is a duty, all Men come to *Knowledg* by *degrees*, and things uſually appear to them in their *probability*, before they appear in *aſcertaining evidence*. Therefore here the Queſtion is, Whoſe judgment I ſhall take as *moſt probable?* (Were the caſe only, how far we ſhould *Preach* our Judgment to others, there *Rulers* muſt more determine; or if it were, How to manage our Judgment ſo as to keep *Unity* and *Concord*, the *Church*, or *major Vote* muſt over-rule us). But it being the *meer Judgment* or *Opinion* that is in queſtion, either we muſt adhere to the Judgment, 1. Of *Rulers* as *ſuch*, 2. Or the *major Vote as ſuch*, 3. Or to thoſe that are *moſt Excellent* in that *part of Knowledg*: Why ſhould I waſte time to give you the Reaſons againſt the two firſt, which are commonly received? When even the *Papiſts*, who go as far as any I know living in aſcribing to *One Man*, and to *major Votes*, yet all agree, that *a few ſubtile Doctors*, yea *one* in the things in which he excelleth, is to be preferred before *Pope* or *Council*: And therefore the *Scotiſts* prefer one *Scotus*, *Lychetus*, *Memiſſe*, *Rada*, &c. before a *Pope* or Multitude; and ſo do the *Nominals*, one *Ockam*, *Gregory*, *Gabriel*, *Hurtado*, &c. and ſo the other Sects.

The thing then being ſuch as neither you, nor any Man can deny, the difficulty which you urge, doth preſs you and all Men: And it is indeed one *grand calamity* of *Mankind*, and not the leaſt hinderance of Knowledg in the World; that he that *hath it not*, *knoweth not* what another hath, but by dark

dark Conjectures. 4. And therefore Parents and Pupils know not who is their beſt Tutor: The hearers that are to chuſe a Teacher, hardly know whom to chuſe; for, as you ſay truly, he muſt know much that muſt judg of a knowing Man.

God hath in all *Arts and Sciences* given ſome few Men an excellency of *Wit and Reach* above the generality of their Profeſſion, and they have a more clear and ſolid Judgment: If *all Men* could but know *who theſe be*, the World would in one Age be more recovered from Ignorance than it hath been in ten. But the *power* of the *Proud*, and the *confidence* of the *Ignorant*, and the *number of all theſe*, and the *Slanders* and *Scorn*, and peeviſh Wranglings of the *common Pride* and *Ignorance* againſt thoſe *few* that *know* what *they know not*, is the Devils great means to fruſtrate their endeavours, and keep the World from having knowledg. This is *certain* and *weighty* Truth, and ſuch as you ſhould make no Malignant applications of, nor ſtrive againſt. Mankind muſt needs acknowledg it. Your urgent queſtioning here [*Do you not mean your ſelf?*] doth but expoſe you to pity, by opening that which you might have concealed.

And to your Queſtion I ſay, could I enable all Ignorant Men to know who are the beſt Teachers, I ſhould be the grand Benefactor of the World: But both the *bleſſing of excellent Teachers*, and alſo of *acquaintance* with them and *their worth*, is given by God, partly as it pleaſeth Him, freely, even to the unworthy, and partly as a Reward to thoſe that have been faithful in a little, and obeyed lower helps; (for there is a *Worthineſs* to be found in ſome Houſes, where the Preacher cometh with the

voice of *Peace*, and *unworthineſs*, which oft depriveth Men of ſuch Mercies.) Both abſolutely *Free-Grace*, and alſo *Rewarding-Grace*, do here ſhew themſelves.

But yet I add, 1. That *Light* is a *ſelf-demonſtrating thing*; and will not eaſily be hid. 2. And thoſe that are the Children of Light, and have been true to former helps and convictions, and are willing to ſell all for the Pearl, and fear not being loſers by the price of *Knowledg*, but would have it whatever Labour or Suffering it muſt coſt, and who ſearch for it impartially and diligently, and forfeit it not by Sloth, or a fleſhly, proud, or worldly Mind, theſe, I ſay, are prepared to diſcern the Light; when others fall under the heavy Judgment of being deceived by the *Wranglings*, *Scorns*, *Clamours* and *Threatnings* of PROUD IGNORANCE. And thus one *Auguſtine* was a Light in his time, and though ſuch as *Proſper*, *Fulgentius*, &c. knew him, *Pelagius* and the *Maſſilienſes* wrangled againſt him: And *Luther*, *Melanchon*, *Bucer*, *Phagius*, *Zuinglius*, *Calvin*, *Muſculus*, *Zanchius* were ſuch in their times; and ſome diſcerned them to be ſo, and more did not: If Men muſt have gone by the judgment of Rulers, or the major Vote of Teachers, what had become of the Reformation? If you can better direct Men how to diſcern Gods Gifts and Graces in His Servants, do it, and do not cavil againſt it.

As for your [*One ſingle Proteſtant in ſuch a caſe as Juſtification*], and your [*I wiſh it be not your meaning*] Pag. 31. they deſerve no further anſwer, nor I all the anger, *pag.* 31, 32, 33.

§. XIX.

§. XIX. But *pag.* 34. Note again, 1. That it is not *Objective Definitions*, (as some *call* them) but [*Logical*, *Artificial Definitions*,] supposed to be Mens needful *Acts*, which you say are *Re*, the same with the *Definitum*. 2. And that yet you must have it [*supposed that these Definitions are true*]. And I suppose that few Good Christians comparatively know a *true one*, no, nor what a Definition, (or the *Genus* and *Differentia* which constitute it) is.

You say, [*I absolutely deny what you so rashly avow, that the Definition of Justification is controverted by the greatest Divines: This is one of your liberal Dictates: The Reformed Divines are all, I think, before you, agreed about the nature of Justification, its Causes, &c. and consequently cannot differ about the Definition*].

Answ. 1. But what if *all Divines* were so *agreed?* So are not *all honest Men and Women* that must have Communion with us: Therefore make not *Definitions more necessary* than they *are*, nor as necessary as the Thing.

2. You must be constrained for the defending of these words, to come off by saying, that you meant, That though they agree not in the *Words*, or *Logical terms of the Definition*; but one saith, *This* is the *Genus*, and *this* is the *Differentia*, and another that it is not *this* but *that*; one saith *this*, and another *that* is the *Formal*, or *Material Cause*, &c. yet *de re*, they *mean* the same thing, were they so happy as to agree in their *Logical* defining terms and notions: And if you will do in this, as you have done in your other Quarrels, come off by saying as I say, and shewing Men the power

of Truth, though you do it with never so much *anger, that you must agree*, I shall be satisfied, that the Reader is delivered from your snare, and that Truth prevaileth, what ever you think or say of me.

3. But because I must now answer *what you say*, and not *what I foresee you will or must say*, I must add, that this passage seemeth to suppose that your Reader liveth in the dark, and hath read very *little* of Justification. 1. Do all those great Divines, who deny the *Imputation of Christs active Righteousness*, and take it to be but *Justitia Personæ, non Meriti*, and that we are Justified by the *Passive only*, agree with their Adversaries, who have written against them, about the *Definition and Causes of Justification?* Will any Man believe you, who hath read *Olevian, Ursine, Paræus, Scultetus, Piscator, Carolus Molinæus, Wendeline, Beckman, Alstedius, Camero*, with his followers in *France, Forbes*, with abundance more, who are for the Imputation of the Passive Righteousness only? Were Mr. *Anth. Wotton*, and Mr. *Balmford*, and his other Adversaries, of the same Opinion in this? Was Mr. *Bradshaw* so sottish as to write his Reconciling Treatise of Justification in *Latine* and *English*, to reduce Men of differing minds to Concord, while he knew that there was no difference, so much as in the Definition? Was he mistaken in reciting the great differences about their Senses of *Imputation of Christs Righteousness*, if there were none at all? Did Mr. *Gataker* agree with *Lucius and Piscator*, when he wrote against both (as the extreams)? Did Mr. *Wotton*, and *John Goodwin*, agree with Mr. *G. Walker*, and Mr. *Robotough*? Doth Mr. *Lawson*,

In

in his *Theopolitica* agree with you, and such others? Doth not Mr. *Cartwright here* differ from those that hold the Imputation of the Active Righteousness?

What abundance of *Protestants* do place Justification only in *Fogiveness of Sins?* And yet as many (I know not which is the greater side) do make that *Forgiveness* but one part, and *Imputation of Righteousness* another. And how many make *Forgiveness no part* of Justification, but a Concomitant? And many instead of [*Imputation of Righteousness*] put [*Accepting us as Righteous, for the sake, or merit of Christs Righteousness imputed*] (viz. as the *Meritorious Cause*). And *Paræus* tells us, that they are of four Opinions, who are for *Christs Righteousness imputed*; some for the *Passive* only; some for the *Passive* and *Active*; some for the *Passive*, *Active*, and *Habitual*; some for these three and the *Divine*. And who knoweth not that some here so distinguish Causes and Effects, as that our *Original Sin* (or *Habitual* say some) is pardoned for Christs *Original* (and *Habitual*) Holiness: Our *Omissions* for *Christs Active Obedience*, and our *Commissions* for His *Passive*? Or as more say that Christs *Passive Righteousness* as Satisfaction, saveth us from Hell or Punishment, and His *Active* as meritorious, procureth *Life* as the reward? When many others, rejecting that Division, say; That both freedom from Punishment, and right to Glory are the conjunct effects of His Habitual, Active, and Passive Righteousness, as an entire Cause (in its kind); as *Guil. Forbes*, *Grotius*, *Bradshaw*, and others truly say: Besides that many conclude with *Gataker*, that these are indeed but one thing and

effect, (to be *Glorified*, and *not to be Damned* or *Punished*); seeing not to be Glorified is the *Pœna damni*, and that the remitting of the whole *Penalty damni & sensus*, and so of all Sin of Omission and Commission, is our whole Justification.

And I need not *tell* any Man that hath read such Writers, that they ordinarily distinguish of Justification, and give not the same Definition of one sort as of *another*, nor of the *Name* in one *Sense* as in another.

Many confess (whom you may read in *Guil. Forbes*, and *Vinc. le Blanck*.) that the word [*Justifie*] is divers times taken in Scripture (as the *Papists* do) as including *Sanctification*: And so saith *Beza* against *Illyricus*, *pag.* 218. as cited by *G. Forbes*, [*Si Justificationem generaliter accipias, ut interdum usurpatur ab Apostolo, Sanctificatio non erit ejus effectus, sed pars aut species*]: And as I find him (*mihi*) *pag.* 179. *Quamvis Justificationis nomen interdum generaliter accipiatur pro omni illius Justitiæ dono quam a patre in Christo accipimus*, &c.

And how little are we agreed whether *Reconciliation* be a *part* of *Justification* or *not?* Yea, or *Adoption* either? Saith *Illyricus* [*Hoc affirmo, recte posse dici Justificationem esse Causam omnium beneficiorum sequentium: Nam justificatio est plena Reconciliatio cum Deo, quæ nos facit ex hostibus filios Dei:*] To which *Beza ibid.* saith, (distinguishing of Reconciliation) *Neutro modo idem est Reconciliatio ac Justificatio.— Si Remissio peccatorum est Justificationis Definitio, quod negare non ausis*, &c.

Of the three sorts or parts of Christs Righteousness imputed to make up three parts of our Justification,

tion, see him *de Predest. pag.* 405. *Col.* 2. which *Perkins* and some others also follow.

Olevian (as all others that grosly mistake not herein) did hold, that *God did not judg us to have fulfilled all the Law in Christ*; and that our righteousness consisteth only in the Remission of Sin, and right to Life as freely given us for anothers Merits: But *Beza* insisteth still on the contrary, and in his Epistle to *Olevian*, (*pag.*248.*Epist.*35.) saith, *Quid vanius est quam Justum arbitrari, qui Legem non impleverit? Atqui lex non tantum prohibet fieri quod vetat,—— verum præcipit quod jubet.—— Ergo qui pro non peccatore censetur in Christo, mortem quidem effugerit; sed quo jure vitam præterea petet, nisi omnem justitiam Legis in eodem Christo impleverit?* (This is the Doctrine which *Wotton* and *Gataker* (in divers Books largely) and *Bradshaw*, after many others do Confute). Yet saith he, *Neque verò id obstat, quominus nostra Justificatio Remissione peccatorum apte & rectè definiatur*], Which is a contradiction. Yet was he for Love and Gentleness in these differences; *ibid.*

Yet *Qu. & Resp. Christ. pag.* 670. He leaveth out Christs Original Habitual Righteousness, [*Non illa essentialis quæ Deitatis est, nec illa Habitualis, ut ita loquar, Puritas Carnis Christi.—— Quæ quum non distingueret Osiander fædissime est hallucinatus.*

And *ibid.* 670. he giveth us this description of Justification.

Qu. *Quid Justificationem vocat* Paulus *hoc loco?* R. *Illud quo Justi simus*, id est, *eousque perfecti, integri*, ἀμεμπτοι καὶ ἄμωμοι, *ut pleniſſime, non tantum aboleatur quicquid in nobis totis in est turpitudinis, qua Deus summe purus offendi ullo modo*

possit, verum etiam in nos comperiatur quicquid in hac humana natura usque adeo potest eum delectare, ut illud vita æterna pro bona sua voluntate coronet].

Yet (as in his *Annot.* in *Rom.* 8. 30. *& alibi*) he confesseth that *Justification* in Scripture, sometime is taken for *Sanctification*, (or as including it) so he taketh our *Sanctification* to contain the Imputation of Christs Sanctity to us. (Qu. & Resp. pag. 671.) 1. *Dico nostras Personas, imputata ipsius perfecta sanctitate & integritate, plene sanctas & integras, ac proinde Patri acceptas, non in nobis sed in Christo censemur.* 2. And next the Spirits Sanctification; and thus Christ is made *Sanctification* to us.

Dr. *Twisse*, and Mr. *Pemble*, *Vind. Grat.* distinguish of Justification as an Immanent Act in God from Eternity, and as it is the notice of the former in our Consciences: But doubtless the commonest Definitions of Justification agree with neither of these: And *Pemble of Justification* otherwise defineth it (as Mr. *Jessop* saith Dr. *Twisse* did).

Lud. Crocius Syntag. pag. 1219. thus defineth it, [*Justificatio Evangelica est actus Divinæ gratiæ, qua Deus adoptat peccatorem per approbationem obedientiæ Legis in sponsore atque intercessore Christo, & per Remissionem peccatorum ac Justitiæ imputationem in eo qui per fidem Christo est insitus*]. And saith, pag. 1223. [*Fides sola justificat quatenus notat Obedientiam quandam expectantem promissionem ut donum gratuitum — & apponitur illi Obedientiæ quæ non expectat promissionem ut donum omnino gratuitum sed ut meritedem propositam sub Conditione operis alicujus præter acceptationem & gratitudinem debitam, quæ sua Natura in omni donatione quamvis gratuita requiri*

requiri solet. Et ejusmodi Obedientia peculiariter opus ab Apostolo, & Latinis proprie Meritum dicitur; & qui sub hac conditione obediunt Operantes vocantur, Rom. 4. 4. & 11. 6. This is the truth which I assert.

Conrad. Bergius Prax. Cathol. dis. 7. *pag.* 983. tells us that the Breme Catechism thus openeth the Matter: [Qu. *Quomodo Justificatur Homo coram Deo?* R. *Accipit Homo Remissionem peccatorum & Justificatur, hoc est, Gratus fit coram Deo in vera Conversione, per solam fidem, per Christum, sine proprio Merito & dignitate.*

Cocceius disp. de via salut. de Just. pag. 189. *Originalis Christi Justitia correspondet nostro Originali peccato, &c. vid. cæt. plura vid. de fœder.*

Mucovius Colleg. de Justif. distinguisheth Justification into *Active* and *Passive*, and saith, *Justificatio Activa significat absolutionem Dei, qua Hominem reum a reatu absolvit:* And he would prove this to be before Faith, and citeth for it (abusively) *Paræus* and *Tossanus*, and thinketh that we were absolved from Guilt from Christs undertaking our Debt, *Thes.* 12. thus arguing, [*Cujus debita apud Creditorem aliquis recepit exsolvenda, & Creditor istius sponsionem ita acceptat, ut in ea acquiescat, ille jam ex parte Creditoris liber est a debitis: Atque Electorum omnium in singulari debita apud Deum Patrem Christus, ex quo factus est Mediator, recepit exolvenda, & Deus Pater illam sponsionem acceptavit,* &c. Passive Justification, which he supposeth to be our application of Christs Righteousness to our selves daily as oft as we offend. *Th.* 5. (And *part* 4. *disp.* 22. he maintaineth, that *There are no*

Dis-

Dispositions to Regeneration). Others of his mind I pass by.

Spanhemius Disput. de Justif. saith, that [The *Form* of *Passive Justification* consisteth in the *apprehension* and *sense* of Remission of Sin and Imputation of Christs Righteousnes in capable Subjects] grosly: Whereas Active Justification (*Justificantis*) ever immediately causeth *Passive* (*Justificationem justificati*) which is nothing but the effect of the Active, (or as most call it, *Actio ut in patiente*): And if this were the *Apprehension* and *Sense* (as aforesaid) of *Pardon* and *imputed Righteousnes*, then a Man in his sleep were unjustified, and so of Infants, *&c.* For he that is not Passively justified, is not at all justified.

I told you else-where, that the *Synops. Leidens. de Justif. pag.* 413. *Th.* 23. saith, That Christs Righteousnes is both the *Meritorious*, *Material*, and *Formal Cause* of our Justification.

What *Fayus*, and *Davenant*, and others say of the *Formal Cause*, viz. *Christs Righteousnes* imputed, I there shewed: And how *Paræus*, *Joh. Crocius*, and many others, deny Christs Righteousnes to be the Formal Cause.

Wendeline defineth Justification thus (Theol. Lib. 1. c. 25. p. 603.) *Justificatio est actio Dei gratuita, qua peccatores Electi, maledictioni legis obnoxii, propter justitiam seu satisfactionem Christi fide applicatam & a Deo imputatam, coram tribunali Divino, remissis peccatis, a maledictione Legis absolvuntur & justi censentur.* And pag. 615, 616. He maintaineth that [*Obedientia activa, si proprie & accurate loquamur, non est materia nostræ Justificationis, nec imputatur nobis, ita ut nostra censeatur,*

&

& nobis propter eam peccata remittantur, & debitum legis pro nobis solvatur; quemadmodum Passiva per imputationem censetur nostra, &c. *Et post* [*Si dicas Christum factum esse hominem pro nobis, hoc est, nostro bono, conceditur: Si pro nobis, hoc est, nostro loco, negatur: Quod enim Christus nostro loco fecit, & factus est, id nos non tenemur facere & fieri,* &c.

Rob. Abbot approveth of *Thompsons* Definition of Evangelical Justification, (pag. 153.) that it is, *Qua pœnitenti & Credenti remittuntur peccata, & jus vitæ æternæ conceditur per & propter Christi obedientiam illi imputatam:* (Which is sound, taking *Imputatam* soundly, as he doth).

Joh. Crocius, Disp. 1. p. 5. thus defineth it, [*Actio Dei qua ex gratia propter satisfactionem Christi peccatoribus in Christum totius Mundi redemptorem unicum, vere credentibus gratis sine operibus aut meritis propriis omnia peccata remittit, & justitiam Christi imputat ad sui nominis gloriam & illorum salutem æternam.* And he maketh only [*Christs full satisfaction for Sin*, to be the *Impulsive-External*, *Meritorious*, and *Material Cause*, as being that which is imputed to us; and the *Form* of Justification to be the *Remission of Sin*, *Original* and *Actual*, or the *Imputation of Christs Righteousness* (which he maketh to be all one) *or the Imputation of Faith for* Righteousness].

Saith Bishop *Downame* of Justif. p. 305. [To be *Formally Righteous by Christs Righteousness imputed, never any of us, for ought I know, affirmed.* The like saith Dr. *Prideaux*, when yet very many Protestants affirm it.

Should I here set together forty or sixty Definitions of Protestants verbatim, and shew you how much

much they differ, it would be unpleasant, and tedious, and unnecessary.

And as to those same Divines that Dr. *Tully* nameth as agreed, Dr. *Davenants* and Dr. *Fields* words I have cited at large in my *Confes.* saying the same in substance as I do; as also Mr. *Scudders*, and an hundred more, as is before said.

And let any sober Reader decide this Controversie between us, upon these two further Considerations.

1. Peruse all the *Corpus Confessionum*, and see whether all the Reformed Churches give us a Definition of Justification, and agree in that Definition: Yea, whether the Church of *England* in its Catechism, or its Articles, have any proper Definition: Or if you will call their words a *Definition*, I am sure it's none but what I do consent to. And if a *Logical Definition* were by the Church of *England* and other Churches held *necessary* to Salvation, it would be in their Catechisms (if not in the Creed): Or if it were held necessary to Church-Concord, and Peace, and Love, it would be in their Articles of Religion, which they subscribe.

2. How can all Protestants agree of the *Logical Definition* of Justification, when 1. They agree not of the sense of the word [*Justifie,*] and of the *species* of that Justification which *Paul* and *James* speak of? Some make Justification to include Pardon and Sanctification, (see their words in *G. Forbes*, and *Le Blanc*); many say otherwise. Most say that *Paul* speaketh most usually of Justification in *sensu forensi*, but whether it include [*Making just*] as some say, or only [*Judging just*] as others, or *Nolle punire*, be the act as Dr. *Twisse*, they agree not. And some hold that in *James Justification* is that

that which is *coram hominibus*, when ſaid to be by *Works*; but others (*truly*) ſay, it is that *coram Deo*.

2. They are not agreed in their very *Logical Rules*, and Notions, to which their Definitions are reduced; no not ſo much as of the number and nature of Cauſes, nor of *Definitions* (as is aforeſaid): And as I will not undertake to prove that all the Apoſtles, Evangeliſts and Primitive Paſtours, knew how to define *Efficient*, *Material*, *Formal* and *Final Cauſes* in *general*, ſo I am ſure that *all* good Chriſtians do not.

3. And when *Juſtification* is defined by Divines, is either the *Actus Juſtificantis*, and this being in the predicament of Action, what wonder if they diſagree about the *Material* and *Formal Cauſes* of it?

Nay, it being an Act of God, there are few Divines that tell us what that Act is: *Deus operatur per eſſentiam:* And *Ex parte agentis*, his Acts are his *Eſſence*, and all but one. And who will thus diſpute of the Definition and Cauſes of them, Efficient, Material, Formal, Final? when I preſumed to declare, that this Act of Juſtifying is not an immanent Act in God, nor without a Medium, but Gods Act by the Inſtrumentality of his *Goſpel-Covenant* or *Promiſe*, many read it as a new thing; and if that hold true that the Firſt Juſtification by Faith, is that which Gods Goſpel-Donation is the Inſtrument of, as the *Titulus ſeu Fundamentum Juris*, being but a *Virtual* and not an Actual Sentence, then the Definition of it, as to the Cauſes, muſt differ much from the moſt common Definitions.

But

But most Protestants say that *Justification* is *Sententia Judicis*. (And no doubt but there are three several *sorts*, or Acts called Justification, 1. Constitutive by the *Donative Covenant*, 2. *Sentential*, 3. *Executive*.) And here they are greatly at a loss, for the decision of the Case, *what Act of God this Sententia Judicis* is. What it will be after death, we do not much disagree: But what it is immediately upon our believing. It must be an *Act* as in *patiente*, or the Divine essence denominated from such an *effect*. And what Judgment and Sentence God hath upon our believing, few open, and fewer agreee. Mr. *Tombes* saith it is a *Sentence* in *Heaven notifying* it to the Angels: But that is not all, or the chief: some run back to an Immanent Act.; most leave it undetermined: And sure the *Name* of *Sentence* in general, signifieth no true Conception of it at all, in him that knoweth not what that *Sentence* is, seeing Universals are *Nothing* (out of us) but as they exist in individuals. Mr. *Lawson* hath said that which would reconcile Protestants, and some Papists, as to the Name, *viz.* that Gods *Execution* is his *Sentence*; He *Judgeth* by *Executing*: And so as the chief punishment is the *Privation of the Spirit*, so the Justifying Act, is the *executive donation* of the Spirit. Thus are we disagreed about *Active Justification* (which I have oft endeavoured Conciliatorily fullier to open.)

And as to *Passive Justification* (or as it is *Status Justificati*) which is indeed that which it concerneth us in this Controversie to open, I have told you how grosly some describe it here before. And all agree not what *Predicament* it is in: some take it to be in that of *Action*, *ut recipitur in passo*; and some in that of Quality and Relation Conjunct: But most

place

place it in Relation; And will you wonder if all Christian Women, yea or Divines, cannot define that Relation aright. And if they agree not in the notions of the *Efficient*, *Material*, *Formal and Final Causes*, of that which must be *defined* (as it is capable) by its *subjectum*, *fundamentum* and *terminus*.

I would not wish that the Salvation of any Friend of mine (or any one) should be laid on the true Logical Definition of Justification, Active or Passive, *Constitutive*, *Sentential* or *Executive*.

And now the Judicious will see, whether the Church and Souls of Men be well used by this pretence, that all Protestants are agreed in the *Nature*, *Causes* and Definition of Justification; and that to depart from that *one* Definition (where is it?) is so dangerous as the Doctor pretendeth, because the *Definition* and the *Definitum* are the same.

§ XX. P. 34. You say [*You tremble not in the audience of God and Man to suggest again that hard-fronted Calumny*, viz. *that I prefer a Majority of Ignorants before a Learned man in his own profession.*

Answ. I laid it down as a Rule, that *They are not to be preferred*: You assault that Rule with bitter accusations, as if it were unsound (or else to this day I understand you not.) Is it then [*a hard-fronted Calumny*] to defend it, and to tell you what is contained in the denying of it. *The audience of God* must be so dreadful to (you and) me, that (without calling you to consider whether the Calumny be not notoriously yours) I heartily desire any judicious person to help me to see, that I am here guilty, if it be so. But you add,

" [*You*

" [*You know not what the Event of all this may be:*
" *For suppose now being drag'd in my Scarlet, (a habit*
" *more suitable for him that Triumphs) at the Wheel of*
" *your Chariot in the view of all men, I should happen to*
" *be degraded and turned out of my literate Society;*
" *would it not trouble you? no doubt: but then it might*
" *happen to be too late.*

Answ. 1. It would trouble me: because (though I know you not) our fame here saith that you are an *honest*, and *very modest man*, and those that are Nicknamed *Calvinists* prefer you before most others of your rank. But alas, what is Man, and what may Temptation do?

2. did you think that your *Scarlet* or *Mastership* did allow you to write copiously, as you did, against your Neighbour who never medled with you, and made it a crime in him, whom you accuse, to defend himself, and a righteous cause? I see in this age we deal on hard unequal terms with some Men that can but get into Scarlet.

3. You would make your Reader believe by these words that you are really Melancholly, and fear where no fear is. A Reverend Doctor, whose Book hath the Patronage of one of the greatest Bps. *of England* writeth against one of no *Academical degree*, who hath these 13. years and more been judged unworthy to preach to the most ignorant Congregation in the Land, and by the (Contrived) distinction of *Nonconformists* from *Conformists*, goeth under the *scorn* and *hatred* of *such*, as you pretend to be in danger of, and hath himself no security for his liberty in the open Air; that this Learned man in his honour, should conceit that an Answer from this hated person might endanger his degradation and turning

turning out of his place, is so strange a fancie, as will make your Readers wonder.

4. But whether you are Melancholly or no I know not; but if you are not *unrighteous*, I know not what *unrighteousness* is. Will you bear with the diversion of a story?

When the *Moors* were sentenced to ruin in *Spain*, one of the Disciples of *Valdesso* (a Scholar) fell into the displeasure of the Bp. of *Toledo:* A Neighbour Doctor knowing that the Bps. favour might bestead him —— (whether accidentally or contrivedly I know not) hit upon this happy course: The Scholar and he being together in a solemn Convention, the Scholar was taking Tobacco, and the Dr. seeing the smok threw first a Glass of Beer in his face, and cryed *Fire*, *Fire*; The Scholar wiped his face, and went on; The Doctor next threw an *Ink-bottle in his Face*, crying still *Fire*, *Fire*; The Scholar being thus blackt, perceived that he was like to be taken for a *Moor*, and ruined, and he went out and carefully wash'd his face: the Doctor charged him openly for affronting him (yea and injuriously calumniating him) by the fact: For saith he, there was necessary Cause for what I did: There is no smoak without some fire: that which fired you might next have fired the House, and that the next House, and so have burnt down all the City: and your action intimateth as if I had done causelessly what I did, and done you wrong: The Scholar answered him; I knew not, Sir, that it was unlawful to wash me, but I will take no more Tobacco that I may no more offend you; But if in this frosty weather the *thicknesse* of my *breath* should be called *smoak*, may I not wash my face, if you again cast your Ink upon it?

No, saith the Doctor, It is not you, nor any private man that must be judg whether you are on Fire or not, in a publick danger: Must the City be hazarded, if you say that it is not Fire? The Scholar asketh, may I not refer the case to the standers-by, and wash my face if they say, It was no Fire? No, saith the Dr. that is but to call in your Associates to your help, and to add *Rebellion* and *Schism* to your disobedience: I perceive what principles you are of. Why then, saith the Scholar, if I must needs be a *Moor*, my face and I are at your mercy.

But pardon this digression, and let you and I stand to the judgment of any righteous and competent Judge, whether you deal not with me in notorious injustice, so be it the Case be truly stated.

The person whom you assaulted is one, that attempted (with success) the subversion of Antinomianism and the clearing of truth; their Ignorance of which was the Cause of their other Errours. But having let fall, (for want of use in writing) some incongruous words (as *Covenant* for *Law*, &c.) and that somewhat often, and some excepting against the Book, he craved their animaversions, and promised to suspend the Book till it were corrected; and purposely wrote a far greater Volumn in explication of what was dark, and defence of what was wrongfully accused, and many other Volumns of full defence: No man answereth any of these: but after twenty years, or thereabout, (though I protested in print against any that would write against the Aphorisms, without regard to the said Explications) you publish your Confutation of part of those Aphorisms, and that with most notorious untruth, charging me to deny *all Imputation of Christs Righteousness*, when

when I had there profeſt the Contrary, and taking no notice of any after-explication or defence, and parallelling me with *Bellarmine*, if not with Hereticks or Infidels (for I ſuppoſe you take the denyers of *all Imputation* to be little better.) This Book you publiſh without the leaſt provocation with other quarrels, dedicating it to that R. Rd. B. who firſt ſilenced me; (as if I muſt go write over again all the Explications and Defences I had before written, becauſe you (that are bound to accuſe me) are not bound to read them:) and this you do againſt one that at that time had been about 13 years ſilenced, ejected, and deprived of all Miniſterial maintenance, and of almoſt all his own perſonal Eſtate, deſiring no greater preferment than leave to have preached for nothing, where is notorious neceſſity, could I have obtained it, ſometimes laid in the common Jail among Malefactors, for preaching in my own houſe, and *dwelling within five miles of it*: after fined at forty pound a Sermon for preaching for nothing; looking when my *Books* and *Bed* are taken from me by diſtreſs, though I live in conſtant pain and langour, the Conſtable but yeſterday coming to have diſtrained for ſixty pound for two Sermons; hunted and hurryed about to Juſtices at the will of any ignorant—— Agent of—— that will be an Informer, and even fain to keep my doors daily lockt, if it may be to ſave my Books a while: Yet the exciting of wroth by *publick Calumny* againſt one ſo low already, and under the perſecuting wrath of *your friends*, was no fault, no injuſtice in you at all! (nor indeed did I much feel it.)

But for me who am thus publickly by *viſible Calumny* traduced, truly to tell you where you miſtake,

and how you wrong Gods Church and Truth more than me, and if also I offer peaceably to wash my own face, this is *hard fronted Calumny, dragging* a Doctor in *Scarlet at the Wheels of my Chariot, which might occasion his degrading and turning out, &c.*

This over-tenderness of your honour as to other mens words, (and too little care of the means of it, as to your own) hath a cause that it concerneth you to find out. Had you the tenth part as many Books written against you, as are against me (by Quakers, Seekers, Infidels, Antinomians, Millenaries, Anabaptists, Separatists, Semi-separatists, Papists, Pseudo-Tilenus, Diocesans, Conformists, and many Enemies of Peace, (to whom it was not I, but your self that joyned you) it would have hardened you into some more patience. If you will needs be militant you must expect replies: And he that will injuriously speak to the World what he should not speak, must look to hear what he would not hear. But you add;

Sir, the Name and Quality of a DOCTOR and Master of a Literate Society, might have been treated more civilly by you.

Answ. 1. I am ready to ask you forgiveness for any word that any impartial man (yea or your Reverend Brethren of that Academy themselves, whom I will allow to be *somewhat partial* for you) shall notifie to me to be uncivil or any way injurious. 2. But to be free with you, neither Doctorship, Mastership nor Scarlet will Priviledg you to fight against *Truth, Right*, and *Peace*, and to vent gross mistakes, and by *gross untruths in matter of fact*, such as is your [*Omnem ludibrio habet imputationem*] to abuse your poor Brethren, and keep the long-

con-

consuming flames still burning, by false representing those as Popish, and I know not what, who speak not as unaptly as your self, and all this without contradiction. Were you a Bp. my *Body* and *Estate* might be in your power, but *Truth*, *Justice* and the *Love of Christians*, and the *Churches peace*, should not be cowardly betrayed by me on pretense of reverence to your Name and Quality. I am heartily desirous that for ORDER-sake the *Name* and *Honour* of my Superiours may be very reverently used. But if they will think that *Error*, *Injustice*, and *Confusion* must take sanctuary under bare *Ecclesiastical* or *Academical Names* and robes, they will find themselves mistaken: Truth and Honesty will conquer when they pass through Smithfield flames: Prisons confine them not; Death kills them not; No siege will force an honest Conscience by famine to give up. He that *cannot endure* the sight of his own excrements must not dish them up to another mans Table, lest they be sent him back again. And more freedom is allowed against *Peace-Breakers* in *Frays* and *Wars*, than towards men that are in a quieter sort of Controversie.

§ XX. P. 36. 37. You say [*For your various Definitions of Justification, Constitutive, Sentential, Executive, in Foro Dei; in foro Conscientiæ, &c.*——*What need this heap of distinctions here, when you know the question betwixt us is of no other Justification, but the Constitutive in foro Dei, that which maketh us righteous in the Court of Heaven? I have nothing to do with you yet in any else, as your own Conscience will tell you when you please: If you have not more Justice and civility for your intelligent Readers, I wish you*

would shew more Compassion to your Ignorant Homagers, and not thus abuse them with your palpable Evasions.

Answ. Doth the question, *Whether the several sorts of Justification will bear one and the same Definition*, deserve all this anger (and the much greater that followeth)?

1. Seeing I am turned to my Reader, I will crave his impartial judgment: I never *received* and *agreed on* a state of the question with this Doctor: He writeth against my books: In those Books I over and over and over distinguish of Justification, *Constitutive*, *Sentential*, and *Executive* (besides those subordinate sorts, by *Witness*, *Evidence*, *Apology*, &c.) I oft open their differences: He writeth against me, as *denying* all *Imputation* of *Christs Righteousness*, and holding *Popish Justification by works*, and never tells me whether he take the word [*Justification*] in the same sense that I do, or in which of those that I had opened: And now he passionately appealeth to my Conscience that *I knew his sence*: What he saith [*my Conscience will tell me*] it is not true: It will tell me no such thing: but the clean contrary, that even after all his *Disputes* and *Anger*, and these *words*, I profess I know not what he meaneth by [*Justification.*]

2. What [*Constitutive in foro Dei, that which maketh us Righteous in the Court of Heaven*] meaneth with him, I cannot conjecture. He denyeth not my Distinctions, but saith, *what need they:* I ever distingnished *Making Righteous*, *Judging Righteous*. *Executively using as Righteous:* The first is in *our selves*; The second is by Divines said to be *in foro Dei*, an act of Judgment; the third is *upon us* after both;

both: now he seemeth to confound the *two first*, and yet denyeth not their difference; and saith, he meaneth [*Constitutive in foro:*] He that is *made Righteous* is such *in se*; and as such is *Justifiable in foro*:] We are *Made Righteous by God* as free *Donor* and *Imputer*, antecedently to judgment: We are *in foro sentenced Righteous by God as Judg*: so that this by *sentence* presupposeth the former: God never *Judgeth us Righteous* and Justifieth us against *Accusation*, till he have first *Made us Righteous* and *Justified us from* adherent Guilt by *Pardon and Donation*. Which of these meaneth he? I ask not my *Ignorant homagers* who know no more than I, but *his Intelligent Reader*. He taketh on him to go the Commonest way of Protestants: And the Commonest way is to acknowledg that a *Constitutive Justification*, or making *the man Just*, (antecedent to the *Actus forensis*) must need go first: but that it is the *second* which *Paul* usually meaneth, which is the *actus forensis*, the *sentence of the Judg in foro*, contrary to *Condemnation*: And doth the Doctor think that to *make Righteous* and to *sentence* as *Righteous* are all one? and that we are *made Righteous in foro* otherwise than to be *just* in *our selves*, and so *Justifiable in foro*, before the *Sentence*? or do Protestants take the *Sentence* to be *Constituting or Making us Righteous*? All this is such talk as had I read it in Mr. *Bunnyan* of the Covenants, or any of my *Ignorant Homagers*, I should have said, the Author *is a stranger to the Controversie, into which he hath rashly plunged himself*: but I have more reverence to so learned a man, and therefore blame my dull understanding.

3. But what if I had known (as I do not yet) what sort of Justification he meaneth? Doth he not

know that I was then debating the Case with him, whether the *Logical Definitions* of *Justification, Faith*, &c. are not a work of Art, in which a *few well studied judicious Divines* (these were my words) *are to be preferred before Authority, or Majority of Votes.* And Reader, what Reason bound me to confine this Case, to *one only sort* of *Justification*? And why, (I say, *why*) must I confine it to a *sort* which Dr. *Tully meaneth*, when my *Rule and Book* was written *before his*, and when to this day I know not what he meaneth? Though he at once chide at my Distinguishing, and tell me that *All Protestants agree* in the *Nature, Causes*, and *Definition*, (and if all agreed, I might know by *other Mens words* what *he* meaneth) yet to all before-said, I will add but one contrary Instance of many.

Cluto, in his very *Methodical* but unsound *Idea Theol.* (signalized in *Voetii Biblioth.*) defineth Justification so, as I suppose, best pleaseth the Doctor, *viz.* [*Est Actio Dei Judicialis, qua redemptos propter passiones justitiæ Divinæ satisfactorias a Christo sustentatas, redemptisque imputatas, a peccatis puros, & consequenter a pœnis liberos, itemque propter Obedientiam a Christo Legi Divinæ præstitam redemptisque imputatam, justitia præditos, & consequenter vita æterna dignos, ex miserecordia pronunciat*]. In the opening of which he telleth us, *pag.* 243. (against multitudes of the greatest Protestants Definitions.) [*Male alteram Justificationis partem, ipsam Justitiæ Imputationem statui, cum Justificatio non sit ipsa Imputatio, sed Pronunciatio quæ Imputatione, tanquam fundamento facto, nititur.*

And

And he knew no ſenſe of Juſtification, but [*Vel ipſam ſententiæ Juſtificatoriæ in mente Divina prolationem, ſive Conſtitutionem, vel ejus in Cordibus redemptorum manifeſtantem Revelationem* : And faith, *Priori modo factum eſt autem omnem fidem, cum Deus omnes, quibus paſſiones & juſtitiam Chriſti imputabat, innocentes & juſtos reputaret, cum ejus inimici, adeoque ſine fide eſſent,* (ſo that here is a Juſtification of Infidels, as innocent for Chriſts Righteouſneſs imputed to them): *Quare etiam ut jam facta fide apprehendenda eſt.* The ſecond which follows faith, is Faith, *ingenerating a firm perſwaſion of it.* Is not here ſad defining, when *neither of theſe* are the Scripture-*Juſtification* by *Chriſt* and *Faith* ?

And ſo §. 32. the *time* of Juſtification by Faith he maketh to be the time when we receive the *feeling* of the former: And the time of the former is preſently after the *Fall*; of all at once: And hence gathereth that [*Ex eo quod Juſtificatio dicitur fieri propter paſſiones & obedientiam Chriſti, quibus ad perfectionem nihil deeſt, nobis imputatas* (before Faith or Birth) *conſequitur innocentiam & juſtitiam in Redemptis quam primum perfectas & ab omni macula puras eſſe*——] and ſo that neither the pronunciation in *mente Divina*, or imputation *ullis gradibus ad perfectionem exſurgat.*

But what is this pronunciation in *mente Divina?* He well and truly noteth, §. 29. that [*Omnes actiones Divinæ, ſi ex eo æſtimentur quod re ipſa in Deo ſunt, idem ſunt cum ipſo Deo, ideoque dependentiam a Cauſa externa non admittant: Si tamen conſiderentur quoad rationem formalem hujus vel illius denominationis ipſis impoſitæ in relatione ad Creaturas conſiſtentem, ipſis cauſæ impulſivæ aſſignare poſ-*

ſunt

ſunt, &c. This diſtinction well openeth, how God may be ſaid to *juſtifie in His own Mind:* But what is that effect, *Unde eſſentia vel mens Divina ita denominatur juſtificans?* Here he is at a loſs, neither truly telling us what is *Juſtication Conſtitutive*, *Sentential*, nor *Executive* (but in the little part of [*Feeling*] *Gods ſecret Act*) yet this dark Definer truly ſaith [*Ex ſenſu Scripturæ veriſſime affirmetur hominem per fidem ſolam juſtificari, quia ex noſtra parte nihil ad Juſtificationem conferendum Deus requirit, quam ut Juſtificationem in Chriſto fundatam credamus, & fide non producamus, ſed recipiamus.*

If yet you would ſee whether all Proteſtants agree in the Definition of Juſtification, read the multitude of Definitions of it in ſeveral ſenſes; in Learnrd *Alſtedius* his *Definit. Theol. c.* 24. §. 2. pag. 97. &c. [*Juſtificatio hominis coram Deo eſt qua homo in foro Divino abſolvitur, ſeu juſtus eſſe evincitur contra quemvis actorem, Deo ipſo judice, & pro eo ſententiam ferente*]. But what is this *Forum? Forum Divinum eſt ubi Deus ipſe judicis partes agit, & fert ſententiam ſecundum leges a ſe latas?* But where is that *Eſt internum vel externum? Forum divinum internum eſt in ipſa hominis Conſcientia, in qua Deus Throunm juſtitiæ erigit in hac vita ibi agendo partes actoris & judicis: Forum Conſcientiæ.* (But it is not *this* that is meant by the *Juſtification by Faith*). *Forum divinum externum eſt, in qua Deus poſt hanc vitam extra hominem exercet judicium,* 1. *Particulare*, 2. *Univerſale.* This is true and well: But are we no where Juſtified by Faith but in *Conſcience*, till after Death? This is by not conſidering, 1. The *Jus ad impunitatem & vitam donatum*

natum per fœdus Evangelicum upon our Believing, which supposing *Faith* and *Repentance* is our *Constitutive Justification*, (*virtually* only *sentential*). 2. And the Judgment of God begun in this Life, pronounced specially by *Execution*. Abundance of useful Definitions subordinate you may further there see in *Alstedius*, and some wrong, and the chief omitted.

The vehement passages of the Doctors Conclusion I pass over; his deep sense of *unsufferable Provocations*, I must leave to himself; his warning of the *dreadful Tribunal* which I am near, it greatly concerns me to regard: And Reader, I shall think yet that his Contest (though troublesome to me that was falsly assaulted, and more to him whose detected Miscarriages are so painful to him) hath yet been *Profitable* beyond the Charges of it to *him or me*, if I have but convinced thee, that 1. *Sound mental Conceptions of so much as is necessary to our own Justification, much differ from proper Logical Definitions: And that*, 2. *Many millions are Justified that cannot define it*: 3. *And that Logical Definitions are Works of Art more than of Grace, which require so much Acuteness and Skill, that even worthy and excellent Teachers may be, and are disagreed about them, especially through the great ambiguity of Words; which all understand not in the same sence, and few are sufficiently suspicious of, and diligent to explain.* 4. *And* therefore that our Christian *Love*, *Peace*, and *Concord*, *should not* be laid *upon such Artificial* things. 5. And that *really* the *Generality* of *Protestants* are agreed mostly in the *Matter*, when they quarrel sharply about many Artificial Notions and Terms in the point of Justification.

tion. (And yet after all this, I shall as earnestly as this Doctor, desire and labour for *accurateness in Distinguishing*, *Defining* and *Method*, though I will not have such things to be Engins of Church-Division.)

And lastly, Because he so *oft* and earnestly presseth me with his *Quem quibus*, *who is the Man*, I *profess* I dreamed not of *any particular Man*: But I will again tell you whom my Judgment magnifies in this Controversie above all others, and who truly tell you *how far Papists and Protestants agree*, viz. *Vinc. le Blank*, and *Guil. Forbes*, (I meddle not with his *other Subjects*), *Placeus* (in Thes. Salmur.) *Davenant*, Dr. *Field*, Mr. *Scudder* (his daily Walk, fit for all families) Mr. *Wotton*, Mr. *Bradshaw*, and Mr. *Gataker*, Dr. *Preston*, Dr. *Hammond*, (*Pract. Cat.*) and Mr. *Lawson* (in the main) Abundance of the French and Breme Divines are also very clear. And though I must not provoke him again by naming some *late English* men, to reproach them by calling them *my disciples*, I will venture to tell the plain man that loveth not *our wrangling tediousness*, that *Mr. Trumans Great Propit.* and Mr. *Gibbons serm. of Justif.* may serve him well without any more.

And while this worthy Doctor and I do both concord with such as *Davenant* and *Field* as to *Justification by Faith or Works*, judg whether we differ between our selves as far as he would perswade the World, who agree *in tertio*? And whether as he hath angrily profest his concord in the two other Controversies which he raised (*our Guilt of nearer Parents sin, and our preferring the judgment of the wisest*, &c.) it be not likely that he will do so also

in

in this, when he hath leisure to read and know what it is that I say and hold, and when we both understand our selves and one another. And whether it be a work worthy of *Good* and *Learned* men, to allarm Christians against one another for the sake of arbitrary words and notions (which one partly useth less aptly and skilfully than the other) in matters wherein they really agree.

2 Tim. 2. 14. *Charging them before the Lord that they strive not about words, to no profit, but to the subverting of the Hearers (yet) study to shew thy self approved unto God, a workman that need not be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of Truth*

Two Sparks more quenched, which fled after the rest from the Forge of Dr. Tho. Tully.

§. 1.

DId I not find that some Mens *Ignorance* and *factious Jealousie* is great enough to make them combustible Recipients of such Wildfire as those *Strictures* are; and did not *Charity* oblige me to do what I have here done, to save the assaulted Charity of such Persons, more than to save any Reputation of my own, I should repent that I had written one Line in answer to such *Writings* as I have here had to do with: I have been so wearied with the haunts of the like Spirit, in Mr. *Crandon*, Mr. *Bagshaw*, Mr. *Danvers*, and others, that it is a work I have

have not patience to be much longer in, unless it were more necessary.

Two sheets more tell us that the Doctor is yet angry; And little that's better that I can find. In the first, he saith again, that [*I am busie in smoothing my way where none can stumble in, a thing never questioned by him, nor by any Man else, he thinks, who owns the Authority of the second Commandment*]. And have I not then good Company and Encouragement not to change my Mind?

But, 1. He feigneth a Case stated between him and me, who never had to do with him before, but as with others in my Writings, where I state my Case my self. 2. He never so much as toucheth either of my Disputations of *Original Sin*, in which I state *my Case* and *defend* it. 3. And he falsly feigneth the Case stated, in words (and he supposeth in a sense) that I never had do do with: Saying, [*I charge you with a new secondary Original Sin, whose Pedegree is not from* Adam: *I engage not a syllable further*]. And pag. 8. *You have asserted that this Novel Original Sin is not derived from our Original Father; no line of Communication between them; a sin besides that which is derived from* Adam,

as

as you plainly and positively affirm]. I never said that it had no *Pedegree*, no line of *Communication*, no kind of derivation from *Adam*. 4. Yea, if he would not touch the Disputation where I state my Case, he should have noted it as stated in the very Preface which he writeth against; and yet there also he totally overlooketh it, though opened in divers Propositions. 5. And the words in an Epistle to another Mans Book, which he fasteneth still on were these; [*Over-looking the Interest of Children in the Actions of their nearer Parents, and think that they participate of no Guilt, and suffer for no Original Sin, but* Adams *only*]. And after, [*They had more Original Sin than what they had from* Adam]. 6. He tells me, that [*I seem not to understand my own Question, nor to know well how to set about my Work*]; and he will teach me how to manage the *Business* that *I have undertaken*, and so he tells me *how* I MUST state the Question hereafter, (see his words). Reader, some Reasons may put a better Title on this Learned Doctors actions; but if ever I write at this rate, I heartily desire thee to cast it away as utter DISHONESTY and IMPUDENCE.

It

It troubleth me to trouble thee with Repetitions. I hold, 1. That *Adams* Sin is imputed (as I opened) to his Posterity. 2. That the degree of Pravity which *Cains* nature received from *Adam*, was the dispositive enclining Cause of all his Actual Sin: 3. But not a necessitating Cause of *all those* Acts; for he might possibly have done less evil and more good than he did. 4. Therefore not the *Total principal Cause*; for *Cains free-will* was *part* of that. 5 *Cains actual sin increased* the *pravity* of his *nature*. 6. And *Cains Posterity* were (as I opened it) *guilty* of *Cains actual sin*; and their *Natures* were the more *depraved* by his *additional pravity*, than they would have been by *Adams sin alone* (unless *Grace preserved* or *healed* any of them).

The Doctor in this Paper, would make his Reader believe that he is [*for no meer Logomachies*] and that the difference is not in *words only*, but *the thing*. And do you think that he differeth from me in any of these Propositions, or how this *sin is derived from* Adam? Yet this now must be the Controversie *de re*.

Do you think (for I must go by *thinking*) that he holdeth any other *Derivation* than this? Or did I ever deny any of this?

But it is vain to state the Case to him: He will over-look it, and tell me what I *should have* held, that he may not be thought to make all this Noise for nothing.

He saith *pag.* 8. [*If it derive in a direct line from the first Transgression, and have its whole Root fastened there, what then? why then some words which he sets together are not the best sense that can be spoken.* It is then but *words*, and yet it is the *thing:* What he may mean by [a *direct Line*], and what by [*whole Root fastened*] I know not; but I have told the World oft enough *what I mean*; and what *he meaneth*, I have little to do with.

But if he think, 1. That *Adams Person* did commit the sin of *Cain*, and of all that ever were since committed; and that *Judas his act*, was *Adams personal act*. 2. Or that *Adams sin* was a *total* or *necessitating* Cause of all the evil since committed; so do not I, (nor doth he, I doubt not). And now I am cast by him on the strait, either to accuse him of *differing de re*, and so of *Doctrinal errour*, or else that he knoweth not when the difference is *de re*, and when *de nomine*, but is so used to confusion, that *Names and Things* do come promiscuously into

into the Queſtion with him: And which of theſe to chuſe, I know not.

The Reader may ſee that I mentioned [*Actual Sin, and Guilt*]: And I think few will doubt, but *Adams* [*Actual ſin*, and *Cains*,] were divers; and that therefore, the *Guilt* that *Cains* Children had of *Adams* ſin and of *Cains* was not the ſame: But that *Cauſa cauſæ* is *Cauſa cauſati*, and ſo that all following Sin was *partly* (but *partly*) *cauſed* by *Adam's*, we ſhall ſoon agree.

He addeth that I muſt make good that *new Original Sin* (for he can make uſe of the word *New*, and therefore *made* it) *doth mutare naturam, as the Old doth. Anſ.* And how far it *changeth it*, I told him, and he taketh no notice of it: The *firſt ſin* changed Nature from *Innocent* into *Nocent*; the *Second* changeth it from *Nocent into more Nocent*: Doth he deny this? Or why muſt I prove any more? Or doth nothing but Conſuſion pleaſe him?

3. He ſaith, I muſt prove that the *Derivation of Progenitors ſins is conſtant and neceſſary, not uncertain and contingent. Anſ.* Of this alſo I fully ſaid what I held, and he diſſembleth it all, as if I had never done it: And why muſt I prove more?

By what Law can he impose on me what to hold?

But really doth he deny that the *Reatus culpæ*, yea and *ad Pœnam*, the Guilt of nearer Parents sins is *necessarily* and *certainly* the *Childs*, though *Grace* may *pardon* it? If he do not, why doth he call on me to prove it? If he do confess the *Guilt*, and deny it *necessary*, when will he tell us what is the *Contingent uncertain Cause?* For we take a *Relation* (such as *Guilt* is) *necessarily* to *result a posito fundamento*.

§. 2. He next cavilleth at my Citations, about which I only say, either the Reader will peruse the *cited words*, and *my words*, *which shew* to what *end I cited them* (to prove our *Guilt* of our *nearer Parents* sins) or he will not. If he *will not*, I cannot expect that he *will read* a further *Vindication*: If *he will*, he *needeth not*.

§. 3. His second *Spark* is *Animadversions* on a sheet of mine; before mentioned, which are such as I am not willing to meddle with, seeing I cannot either *handle* them, or *name* them as the nature of them doth require, without offending him: And if what is here said (of *Imputation* and *Re-*

pre-

preſentation) be not enough, I will add no more, nor write over and over ſtill the ſame things, becauſe a Man that will take no notice of the many Volumns which anſwer all his Objections long ago, will call for more, and will write his Animadverſions upon a ſingle Sheet that was written on another particular occaſion, and pretend to his diſcoveries of my Deceits from the *Silence* of that *Sheet*, and from my naming the *Antinomians*.

I only ſay, 1. If this Mans way of Diſputing were the *common way*, I would abhor *Diſputing*, and be aſhamed of the *Name*.

2. I do friendly deſire the Author of the *Friendly Debate*, Mr. *Sherlock*, and all others that would faſten ſuch Doctrines on the *Non-Conformiſts*, as a Character of the *Party*, to obſerve that this Doctor ſufficiently confuteth their partiality; and that their Academical Church-Doctors, are as *Confuſed*, as *Vehement* maintainers of ſuch expreſſions as they account moſt unſavoury, as any even of the *Independants* cited by them: Yea, that this Doctor would make us queſtion whether there be now any *Antinomians* among us, and ſo whether all the Conformiſts that have charged the Conformiſts,

yea,

yea or the *Sectaries*, with having among them Men of such unsound Principles, have not wronged them, it being indeed the Doctrine of the Church of *England* which they maintain, whom I and others call *Antinomians* and *Libertines:* And I hope at least the sober and sound *Non-Conformists* are Orthodox, when the vehementest *Sectaries* that calumniated my Sermon at *Pinners Hall*, are vindicated by such a Doctor of the Church.

3. I yet conclude, that if this *One Mans Writings* do not convince the Reader, of the *Sin and Danger* of Allarming Christians against one another, as Adversaries to great and necessary Doctrines, on the account of meer *Words* not *understood*, for want of accurateness and skill in the expressive Art, *I take him to be utterly unexcusable.*

Pemble Vind. Grat. p. 25. *It were somewhat if it were in Learning as it is in bearing of a Burthen; where many weak Men may bear that which One or few cannot: But in the search of* Knowledg, *it fares as in discrying a thing afar off; where* one quick-sight *will see further than a thousand clear Eyes.*

FINIS.

I had not time to gather the *Errata* of any but the First Book: Correct *these Greater*, or you will misunderstand the Matter.

PAge, 27. Line 2. Read self, *the Act*. p. 54. l. 30. r. *as* obliging. p. 58. l. 20. for of r. or, p. 59. l. 1, and 2. r. who is *not*. p. 86. l. 32. for OURS r. OUR Righteousness. p. 88. l. 7. for Covenanted r. Connoted. p. 97. l. 31. r. *and* suffering. p. 103. l. 9, 10. for have us Holy, r. leave us unholy. p. 110. l. 10. for we, r. were. p. 111. l. *penult*. and p. 112. l. 5. and 10. for our, r. one. l. 21. for but, r. must. p. 115. l. 25. for raze out, r. rake up. p. 117. l. 18. r. personating Representation. p. 118. l. 2. for *Minister*, r. Meriter. p. 119. l. 16. for *are*, r. are *not*. p. 140. l. 23. for if, r. that. p. 126. l. 23. for arrive, r. arm. p. 149. l. 19. r. *and* the. p. 153. l. 23. r. *and* will. p. 154. l. 26. r. our own-innocency, it. p. 157. l. 29. r. Private, but. p. 169. l. 2. r. conditional. p. 177. l. 9. r. sufficiency. p. 181. l. 27. for argument, r. agreement.

The Lesser Errata.

PReface p. 3. l. 16. r. eternal. Contents, p. 2. l. 21. r. *Wotton*. p. 11. l. 4. for no, r. in. l. 17. r. prætendit. l. 27. r. sufficere. p. 12. l. 1. r. ficantur: l. 16. r. impetrando, l. *antipen*. r. Credimus. p. 13. l. 2. r. præcedit. p. 16. l. 26. r. Schlussel Burgius. p. 22. l. 9. for that, r. the p. 36. l. *antipen*. dele by. p. 55. l. 10. for no, r. not. p. 60. l. 15. for then, r. there. p. 64. l. 5. for of, r. or. p. 68. l. 28. r. *so* to. p. 80. l. 17. r. if you will *fontes*. p. 91. l. 20. dele *the*. p. 94. l. 2. for *but*, r. *as*. l. 11. dele *and*. p. 102. l. 1. r. per. p. 104. l. *antipen*. r. Albericus. p. 135. l. 20. r. prædictus. l. 23. r. aliquem. p. 112. l. 28. r. relatione. p. 116. l. 21. r. *fulfillers*. p. 120. l. 11. r. Vasquez. p. 150. l. 26. r. indebitæ. p. 167. l. 29. for if, r. is. p. 184. l. *penult*. for as, r. and.

In a Cursory view of some Pages, I since see these faults.

PReface, Page 8. Line 22. for and, r. as. Book 1. P. 172. l. 1. r. *is it true.*

Answer to the Letter, P. 93. l. ult. for Conformists, r. Nonconformists. Book 2. Part 3. P. 16. l. 20. for *tum*, r. *tu*. P. 54. l. 14. for apt, r. yet, l. 28. for produceth, r. proceedeth. P. 56. l. 13. for still, r. not. P. 65. l. 13. for Guilt, r. Gift. Book 2. Part 1. P. 259. l. 8. r. *Causas*. P. 268. l. 4. for first, r. full. P. 269. l. 28. fore Jure, r. iu re.

And I must tell the Reader that it is so long since the Papers to Mr. *Cartwright* were written, that if there be any passage which in my later Writings I correct, I must desire him to take the latter as my Judgment: For I am none of those that pretend my Youthful Writings to be sufficiently Accurate, much less Faultless, or that to avoid the Imputation of Mutability, profess to be no wiser than I was between twenty and thirty Years ago. I find somewhat, Book 2. Part 3. P. 51, 52. which needeth this Explication, *viz.*

[*God as Judg of lapsed Man, when He was judging him, added an Act of Grace, which in several respects is,* 1. *A Promise.* 2. *A Deed of Gift.* 3. *An Act of Oblivion or universal conditional Pardon.* 4. *A Law.* 5. *And as it hath respect to* Christs absolutely promised *and* foreseen Merits, *it may be said, to be* like *or* Equivolent *to an universal conditional Sentence: But taking the word* [Sentence] *strictly as it is* [*a Sentence of the Individuals according to the Rule of a Law as kept or broken*], *so it is not properly a Sentence as to us* (*as is after proved.*)

May 26. 1652.

An Account of my Consideration of the Friendly, Modest, Learned Animadversions of Mr. *Chr. Cartwright* of *York*, on my Aphorisms.

Of God's Legislative and Decretive Will.

Aphor. as cited by Mr. *C.*

Page 2. *THe distinction of God's Will, into his Will of Purpose, and his Will of Precept, &c. It is near of Kin to the common distinction of* Voluntas signi & Beneplaciti, *but not the same.*

Mr. C's *Animadversions.*

I think it is the same as *Praeceptum* is called *Voluntas signi*, though some do not so clearly and fully explain this Distinction as others do.

R. B's Reply.

I am glad you begin with this Distinction, that I may have my apprehensions of it more fully cleared; where they are right, confirmed; and if unsound, that they may be changed. For I confess, make use of this Distinction, as a Key to my understanding of very many points in Divinity, to which it is not commonly applied. The confounding of our Ethicks and Physicks, and so of their distinct Fountains, doth introduce confusion into the main Body of Theology, with those that are guilty of it: And it is easie to conceive, that it is necessary to the understanding of Theological Controversies, to avoid that confusion, and know to which of these the Question doth belong. It is easie to conceive what work it would make in *Philosophical* Discourses, to confound our *Physicks* and *Ethicks*; and it will have no better effect in *Theological*. Therefore, as I take *Debitum* to be the direct proper Object of our *Ethicks*; and *Ens Reale*, of our Physicks (for I take not the term [Physicks] in the common restrained sense, as its Object is *only Corpus Naturale*; but as it is ὀντολογία, as some call Metaphysicks, and containeth *much of Metaphysicks*, (for I conceive that which treateth *de Ente Reali* should be one entire Doctrine) *Pneumaticks*, and *common Physicks all*: So I take [*Ethicks*] in so large a sence, as to comprehend *Oeconomicks*, *Politicks*, and all *Morality*:) So I do distinguish of *God's Will* here, according to these *different Objects*. As *Ens Reale*, is the *Object*, or *Product* of his Will, for want of a better name, I call it, his *Decretive Will*, or *Will of Purpose*: And because in most of our Theological Discourses, we are fain to speak of God's

God's Will, according to the imperfect manner of mans will, as if it respected its Object as present, past, future; therefore *Res futuræ, & Rerum futuritio* are usually made the Objects, or Products of God's *Decree* or *Purpose* (for man *purposeth* only *de futuro*:) (And indeed *quoad hominem*, the thing being *truly future*, so *God* may be said to *Decree* that *quoad hominem* it *shall be future*; though *quoad ipsum Deum non est futurum.*) But I sometime say, *Eventus* is the *Object* of *this Will*; meaning thereby *Res eveniens*, and so connecting the *Thing* with its Emanation from its first Cause; and intending the Comprehension of all Beings, past, present, and future. And also, that I may comprehend *Privations*, which as they are *Reductively* belonging to the Doctrine of *Beings*; so may they also to the *Object* of *God's Will de Eventu*. For as *mans Will* may be *de Agere vel non Agere*, *de esse vel non esse*; so we may conceive of *God's Will*: (Though *Scotus* hath shewed the truth of this Conception to be very disputable.) Therefore when I say that *Ens Reale* is the *Object*, or *Product* of *this Will* of God, I mean both the *Esse & non Esse*, *Beings and Privations*; but one *directly* and *properly*, the other but *consequenter & reductivè*: As in saying *Debitum* is the *Object*, or rather *Product* of God's *Ethical*, or *Legislative Will*, I mean both the *Debere & non Debere*; but the former only *directly*, the latter but *indirectly*, *consequenter & reductivè*; as proceeding only from God's *not-commanding*-or-*prohibiting*, and properly being *Nothing*, and having *no Cause* in Morality: I mean, the [*Non-debeo agere*;] for in the [*Debeo non agere*] which is caused by *Prohibitions*, the *Debitum* is *Positive formaliter*, though

the *quasi subjecta materia*, *vel res debita*, be but *nominal*, and really *nothing*.

1. So that by God's *Decretive Will*, I mean only his *Will de Eventu*, *vel de Ente qua tali*; and by his *Legislative Will*, I mean only his *Will de Debito*: So that I primarily distinguish of the *Objects*, or *Products* of God's Will; and thence of *his Will itself*. This I expressed fully in my Aphorisms: So that my main scope is, but to keep open the difference between *Naturality*, and *Morality* in all our Discourses.

2. And I have there also manifested, that therefore I take the Act of Willing in God to be the same in both. *Velle Debitum*, is as properly *Velle*, as is *Velle Eventum*.

3. And that I distinguish of the Objects here, but *formaliter*: For *Debitum* is *Ens quoddam* (according to the common Doctrine: Though I think, as *Burgersdic. Metaph.* Relations are *inter entia & Nihil*:) But I mean therefore *Debitum qua Debitum*, & *Eventum qua Eventum*, *vel Ens qua Ens*.

God's Will is, 1. *De Ente in genere.* 2. *In specie*, 1. *De Ente Naturali.* 2. *De Ente Morali*; *i. e. De Jure vel debito.*

4. And therefore as the Doctrine *de Eventu vel de Ente*, is far more Comprehensive than the Doctrine *de Jure* (*Jus vel Debitum* being but an *inferior Species* of *Ens*; taking *Ens* so largely as to comprehend *Modalities* and *Relations*:) so *God's Will de Ente vel Eventu*, comprehendeth his Will *de Debito*: But yet *his Will de Debito*, *qua Debitum*, may well be distinguished from his *Will de Ente qua tali*; as the *Specifick* nature from the *Generical*.

5. I

5. I also (and principally) shewed you, that I comprehend two things in my phrase of [*God's Legislative Will,*] or [*his Will de Debito*] 1. The *Immanent Will* of God *de Debito*; which is as true, and as Eternal an Act, as his *Velle Eventum.* 2. The *signal Will* of God, which is *his Law*: This I told you, I call *his Will* but *Metonymically.*

6. Both these together, and neither alone, do *Constituere Debitum*; 1. Not God's *Immanent act alone*, or directly; for it is not properly *Lex*, till it be *signified*; much less *Lex promulgata.* 2. Nor the *Law*, or *signum* considered in it self, abstracted from the *Will signified*; but only considered *Formaliter ut signum*, and so with its correlate; *viz.* The *Immanent Will signified.*

7. My full meaning therefore is, but to distinguish *God's Law*, from his *other Acts and Works.* But I choose to call it [*his Legislative Will,*] rather than [*his Law:*] 1. Lest it should be thought I include only the *Law materially*, and exclude the *Immanent Will*, which was from Eternity *de Debito.* 2. Because if I should distinguish between [*God's Will,*] and [*his Law*] it would plainly sound as if I contradistinguished his *whole Will* from *his Law*, and so even his *Will de Debito*, which is the *Soul of his Law*, the *Signum* being but the *Body.*

8. And I fully told you, that therefore I call it his [*Legislative Will,*] rather than (as others hitherto) his [*Will of Precept*;] because *the Law* hath *several parts*, which constitute a *several Debitum*: *Precept* is but *one* of these parts, but I speak of *all.* The false Definitions of *Law* have long wronged the World; while men reduced it all to *Precept*,

or to be *Regula actionum moralium.* The Law determineth (in the large, and yet proper sence, as I will take Law) *de omni Debito, Moraliter & propriè sic dicto:* 1. What shall be *due from us*; that is, in the *Precept* and *Prohibition.* 2. What shall be *due to us*; that is, in, 1. The *Promise.* 2. The *Threat*: Besides *Fundamental Distributions.*

So that the Product of God's *Legislative Will*, is, 1. *Debitum rei libere & absolutè Donatæ.* 2. *Debitum officii nostri (in agendo & non-agendo.)* 3. *Debitum præmii.* 4. *Debitum pœnæ.*

Thus I have all close together, and once again told you my meaning (as plain as I can with brevity) in this Distinction. And understand, that I undertake not to shew you how far other mens sence of it is the same with mine: But our Question is, Whether this that I have opened, be the Schoolmens sence of their Distinction of [*Voluntas signi & Beneplaciti?*] I conclude, that it is not, and that for these *Reasons.*

1. *Implere & permittere naturaliter (ut à permissione morali distinguitur)* which are some of their *signa*, are utterly unreducible to this Legislative Will.

2. Both the terms of their Distinction, and their Explication, shew that they intend not to distinguish God's Will *ab objectis*; *Event and Right*: But as it is *in it self*, and as it is manifested to us: And therefore *Voluntas signi* with them, is *Voluntas significata*, or *signum Voluntatis:* But not one act of that Will signified as distinct from another (as to our apprehension;) but the same that is before termed *Voluntas Beneplaciti*, is it as signified. And therefore some of them do again subdistinguish their

five

five signs, noting, that some of them (*Præceptum, prohibitio, Consilium*) do determine *Duty*; and the other signifie *Event*. So *Lombard* himself more fully and plainly than almost any of his followers; And so *Aquinas* and many more also do. And so they may as well subdistinguish the *Voluntas Beneplaciti*, into *Beneplacitum de Eventu, & de Debito*. I could by multitudes of their sayings, manifest this that I say, of the plain importance of their words, were it not a vain loss of time and labour, specially to you that I know have so frequently read it.

Dist. 45. l. 1. So Dorbellis in Sent. ibid. & Viguerius Institut c. 3. §. 1. pag. 22. Aquin. 1. q. 19. a. 12. 3.

3. And therefore they use the Distinction of *Voluntas secreta & revelata*, as the same in sence with *Beneplaciti & signi*: But it is not the same with *mine*; for *Voluntas de Eventu est partim secreta partim (in prophetiis & Causis secundis) revelata.*

4. And they plainly exclude the *Immanent Act of God's Will de Debito*, from their *Vol. signi*, by the very name. For the *Immanent Act* is not *sui ipsius signum nec alterius.*

5. And as plainly do they exclude it by saying, that *Volunt. signi* is but *Metaphoricè God's Will*; Whereas the *Immanent Act* is *properly* his *Will*, and the *signum* is more *Metonymicè* than *Metaphoricè* his *Will*. I think I needed no more proof; but if these convince you not, the matter is of very small moment what *they* mean. Divers of our own more clear Divines indeed, do come near my meaning in their Distinction of *Vol. Præcepti & Propositi*: As Judicious *Davenant Dissertat. de Redempt. Univers. pag. 126. Rivet. Exercit. in Gen. 107. pag. (mihi)*

524. *Vossius Hist. Pelag. l. 7. part. 1. Thes. 1. & 2. per tot. & in Thes. de Pelagianismo D. Chamier Panstrat. Tom. 3. l. 7. c. 6. ad loc. 1 Tim. 2. & 2 Pet. 3. Conrad. Bergius Prax. Cathol. diss. 6. p.888. Zanchius* sometimes expresseth it one way, and sometimes near as I; as, *Tom. operum ult. p. (mihi) 679. & de Natura Dei, l. 3. c. 4. p. 257, 258. per tot. & 254.* Especially *Rutherford* (cited by you, who followeth *Twiss*) and *Camero pag. 642. Oper. in fol. Gen. cont. Tilen.* most plainly: And *Twiss* most frequently, *Vindic. Grat. l. 2. part. 1. Crim. 3. §. 1. & §. 11.* And Discovery of Dr. *Jackson's* Vanity, *ad §. 2. pag. 535, & p. 536, & 550.* And Consider. of *Tilenus* against *Synod. Dort. pag. 166. & Vindic. Grat. l. 2. part. 1. p. (Volum. minoris)* 173, 174. *Amyraldus Specim. Animadv. Special. p. 71.* Learned *Rob. Baronius* in *Philosoph. Theolog. Ancill. Exercit. 3. Art. 14. pag. 211.* And indeed the first that made me sensible that this Distinction differed from the School-distinction of [*Benepl. & signi,*] was *Twiss* and *Camero*: Yet it must be acknowledged, that *Twiss* himself (who makes more use of it than all others that I have read) overlooked (at least usually) the *Immanent Will of God de Debito*, and spake only of the *Precept* it self; and therefore calleth it God's Will *Metaphorically*. If I may prefer Truth before Modesty, I must say, that Dr. *Twiss* saw further into the nature and use of this Distinction than others before him had done; but yet his Notions were very imperfect of it, and his Improvement very short, in respect to its desert and use. And therefore he called it but *Voluntas Præcepti*, and applied it only to matter of *Precept and Prohibition*; but saw not that it belonged also to *Promise and Commination*,

Commination, even to the *whole Law*. And though he makes *Præcipere & Vetare* to be the Objects of of this Will (which clearly implies, that he took in the Immanent Act of which they were the Objects) *Lib. 2. part. 1. Crim. 3. §. 11.* yet he so often contradicteth it by speaking otherwise, that I doubt it fell from him *ex improviso*. One more let me name you, whom you must oppose with me, and that is *Molinæus Anato. Armin. c. 4.* where he speaks against them that call the *Decree* God's *Secret Will*, and the *Commandment* his *Revealed Will*, as speaking inconsiderately. §. 8. & §. 9. he saith, Thomas *and the Schoolmen do distinguish God's Will into* Volun. Beneplaciti & Volunt. signi: *The members of which Distinction fall one into another: For many things of his* Vol. Beneplaciti, *are signified too: Neither is the word* Beneplaciti, *which is* in Gr. εὐδοκία, *sufficiently applied here; For* εὐδοκία *doth for the most part include Love and Good-will*, &c. And §. 3, 4, 5. he well explains the *Legislative Will* in part. And he saw, §. 6, 7. that even *Promises* and *Threatnings* were reducible to it. But yet he thought it was improperly; and so §. 6, & 7. it is plain that he did not fully yet understand the due extent of this Will: Else; 1. He would have acknowledged the *Immanent Act*, as well as the *Signal*. 2. And have seen, that the *pars Legis præmians & puniens* (i.e. *Comminatio*) do as properly *Constituere Debitum præmii & pœnæ*, as the *Præceptum* doth the *Debitum officii*: and consequently are most proper *signs* of *God's Will de Debito*. 3. And he would not have turned here to dispute against *Conditional Will* in God; but would have seen, that God hath doubtless a *Conditional Law*, and so a *Conditional Will de*

de Debito, whatever he hath *de Eventu*. But enough of mens Opinions. To proceed.

Aphor.

Pag. 3. *And indeed the Schoolmen do intend no other Will, but the same which they call* Beneplaciti; *whose Object is* Event, *as it is uncertainly represented to us by these signs*; (viz. *contained in that Verse*, Præcipit ac prohibet, permittit, consulit, implet.) *And because they are such uncertain signs (the contrary to what they seem to import being oft certain) therefore they tell us that this is but Metaphorically called God's Will*, &c.

Animadvers.

1. I do not see how *Impletio*, fulfilling; or *Operatio*, working, as *Aquin.* hath it, *Part.* 1. *q.* 19. *a.* 12. can be called an *uncertain sign*: For if God *fulfil*, or *work* a thing, it is a sure and undoubted sign that he doth *will it*. For he doth not work either against or besides his Will; so it is also in respect of *Permission*. For if God *permit* a thing to be done, it is certain that his Will is to have it done. *Non fit aliquid nisi omnipotens fieri velit, vel sinendo ut fiat, vel ipse faciendo.* Aug. Enchir. c. 95.

2. *Aquin.* indeed (*ibid.*) *a.* 11. makes *Volunt. signi* to be *Metaphorically* called *God's Will*; and so doth Dr. *Twiss*, yet he understood (and so I suppose did *Aquinas*) the Distinction so, as to be in effect all one with yours. *Voluntas signi propriè præceptum dicitur, improprie licet usitatè dicitur Voluntas. At Voluntas Beneplaciti Voluntas propriè dicta. Præcepta enim judicant quid Deus velit esse nostri officii ut à nobis fiat; non autem judicant quid sit decreti sui, ut ipse faciat, vel fieri permittat.* Dr. Twiss. Vind. l. 2. *digr.* 2. *c.* 13. *Voluntas signi Improprie dicitur Voluntas: Significat enim tantum quid ab homine fieri Debeat, aut quid placitum sit Deo, si fiat. At Voluntas Beneplaciti, propriè & simpliciter est Voluntas, quâ nempe decrevit, quid futurum sit, Deo aut efficiente, aut permittente.* Ibid. l. 1. part. 1. sect. 12. §. 2. Observe, that he speaks of *Voluntas signi*, so far forth as this *Signum* is *Præceptum*; and in that respect I take *Voluntas signi*, to be the same with the *Will of Precept*, as you call it. And so (it seems) did Dr. *Twiss* take

take it; for you see he makes mans duty to be the Object of *Voluntas signi*, even as you do of God's *Will of Precept*. When therefore he saith, That *Volunt. signi* is improperly called *God's Will*; he means only, that *God's Precept* is improperly called his *Will*, it being properly the *sign*, or *signification* of his Will: Not but that God *truly*, and *properly* willeth that which the Precept containeth; Not always that it *shall be done*, but always that it shall be be *mans duty* to do it, as the Doctor expresly speaketh, and (I suppose the Schoolmen meant no otherwise.) But, *Rhetorfortis* doth yet more plainly describe *Vol. signi*; so as you do God's *Preceptive Will. Voluntas approbans* (*seu signi*) *non revelat nobis Intentionem seu decretum Dei. Hæc enim & similia*, [Cain, Saul, Juda, *obedite & credite*] *non habent hoc pro re significatâ, aut volitâ à Deo*, [*Mea hæc est Intentio, & Decretum est apud me ab æterno, ut obediretis*; &c.] *Sed tantum dicit Deus*; *Hoc præcepto* Caino, & Saulo, &c. *proposito, ego indico & revelo, mihi gratam & acceptam esse obedientiam, ad quam ex lege & debito obligati estis Creatori Vestro, siquidem ei accepti esse velitis, sive actu obediatis, sive non.* Rhetorf. Exer. 2. c. 1. §. 5. *quando Deus Jussit* Abrahamum *Immolare filium, non tenebatur* Abrahamus *credere Immolationem* Isaaci *esse Decretam & Intentam à Deo, sed sui esse officii ut Immolaret* Isaacum. ibid.

Reply.

1. I never intended when I wrote that, to assert, That *Impletion* was an uncertain sign of God's Will: But the other four signs are uncertain, as to the *Event*. But I see I should have so cautelously expressed my self, that my speech might not have been so liable to misinterpretation. Yet if I mistake not the usual meaning of the Schoolmen, that under the *Will Beneplaciti & signi*, even under each branch, they comprehended *God's Will* about *whatsoever Object*; then *Impletio Voluntatis Beneplaciti de Eventu non est signum Voluntatis Beneplaciti de Jure*. The killing of Christ was no sign, that it was *God's Pleasure* that it should be the Jews *duty* to kill him. Your yielding the *three first* to be *uncertain signs*, shews that the Schoolmens Distinction

on is not the same with mine: For they are not *uncertain signs* of God's *Immanent Will de Debito.*

2. I perceive no proof of your Assertion, That *Permission* is a certain sign of God's *Will de Eventu*: [If God permit a thing (say you) to be done, it is a certain sign it is his Will to have it done.] I believe not this. Indeed, if a thing *be done on God's Permission*, it is a certain sign he *would* permit it to be done: But not, *if he permit it*, therefore *would he have it done*; that is, the *event* (that *it is done*) whether by *Permission*, or *Efficiency*, is a certain sign that he Willed that Event, or to permit that Event. But the *Permission* is no such sign that he Willed the Event, but only it is a sign that he Willed that *Permission*. For God permitteth that which never cometh to pass. Doth he not permit the wicked to amend? the Drunkard to be sober? *&c.* I think he doth *permit it*, and *more* than permit it. Indeed, where the Creature hath a natural, or adventitious inclination to the Act (as a stone to fall downward, a sinner to do wickedly, *&c.*) and there are the *mediums* at hand which are necessary thereto, there Gods bare Permission is certainly connexed to the following Event; and consequently, is

Pennotus interpreteth the Schoolmen thus: *Voluntas signi est illa secundum quam Deus denominatur Volens non secundum rei veritatem, sed per quandam Metaphoram & Similitudinem, quia Causando aliquos effectus se gerit per modum volentis in quantum aliquid vel præcipit, vel consulit, vel facit: ut docet* D. Thom. in 1. dist. 45. q. 1. a. 4. & 1. q. 19. a. 11. & 12. *Ob quam causam divinum consilium vel præceptum dicuntur etiam Voluntas signi per Metonymiam; quia sunt effectus & signa ejusdem divinæ voluntatis, ad eum modum quo ultimum testamentum, quod quis moriens condit, appellare solemus ultimam illius Voluntatem, &c.* Pennot. Propugn. l. 4. c. 20. p. 224.

is a sign, that (in some sort) he willeth it. But where the Creature needs God's *actual help*, yea, his *special Grace* to perform any act, I think *his bare Permission* is no such sign that he *willeth the Event*. If it be, sure God willeth the Sanctification, or Repentance of Reprobates, when he doth so much *more than permit it*; (except we take up Dr. *Twisse's* poor conceit, that *Actus elicitus volendi videtur propriè dici non posse impediri. Quia tum dici solet aliquis impediri, cum non sinitur facere quod vult.* Vind. Grat. l. 2. part. 2. Digres. 6. p. 360. As if the not-hindering of an *Active Power* to move, according to the *inclination* of its *Habits*, and the *drawing* of its *Object*, were not properly *Permission*.) If you take *permittere*, either *properly* for *non-impedire*, as it respecteth *Acts*; or *improperly*, for *non-alteration*, as it respecteth *Qualities*: In both senses, *Permission* is *no sign* that God willeth the *Event*. I believe you judg, that *Twiss* in his Digression hath justly questioned *Perkin's* saying, *Quicquid non impedit Deus, ideo evenit quia Deus non impedit.*

All this I speak of *Permission-Natural*; for as for *Moral-Permission*, either *per Legem, vel in Moribus*, it is beyond all doubt, that it is *no sign* infallible of God's willing the *Event* of the thing permitted. And for *Austin's* saying (cited so commonly) what is it to your purpose? If it be true, that *Non fit aliquid nisi omnipotens fieri velit, vel sinendo*, &c. (the [*fit*] is the *signum*;) doth it therefore follow, that *Non permittitur aliquid nisi quod Deus fieri velit?* But if *Permission* be a sign of God's Will, what shall we think of that Doctrine, that denieth that there is any such thing as God's *Permission* of any Action that ever was done in the World? I think

the

the Doctrine of [*The Necessity of Physical efficient Predetermination to every act of the Creature,*] is guilty of this, as its direct Consequence (if I may so far excuse) which yet some Divines, especially *Twiss*, do lay so great weight on; when it is not from Christ, or *Paul*, but the Dominicans. For how can God be said to permit that act, which he is the principal determining efficient Cause of.

As for your Allegation out of *Aqu. Twiss*, and *Rutherford*, that they mean as I: I answer, 1. Their making *Voluntas signi* but *Metaphorically Voluntas*, shews the contrary. 2. You confess that it is but [so far forth as this *Signum* is *Præceptum:*] But then sure the Distinction, 1. Speaking *de signo ut signo, & de præcepto ut signo*; and 2. Of four more signs, cannot be the same with mine. 3. *Twisse's* is above half the same as mine; for indeed I received it from him: But, 1. He saw further into it than the Schoolmen (or than most of our own) and *Rutherford* follows him. 2. Yet he seems to take no notice of the *Immanent Will de Debito*, whereof the *Precept* is *signum*: Nor yet doth he extend it to the *whole Law*, but only to *Precept*: Nor do I find him speaking, as you friendly interpret him, that [*It is properly the sign, or signification of his Will,* &c.] I make God's Will *de Debito* (which I shall take leave to call, his *Legislative*, or *Ethical Will*) to stand at the top in the *Series* of our *Ethicks*, indeed the Fountain of all Due: And his Will *de Ente*, *vel Eventu*, to stand at the top of our *Philosophy de Ente*. Lastly, I will not contend any more about this, seeing I am glad if you be in the right: For as it confirmeth me, to have you of my Judgment; so will it do more, to have so many such as those named.

Aphor.

Aphor.

Page 9. *These Absolute Promises, are but mere gracious Predictions what God will do for his Elect.*

Animadverf.

I dislike not this: but your self elsewhere seems to dislike it; viz. *Append. p.* 49. For it being objected, [*But all these are rather Prophecies, than Promises.*] You answer, *If that which expresseth the engaging of the Word, or Truth of God, be not a Promise, I would you would tell me what is.*

Reply.

In the last you perswade me, that others agree with me more than I was aware of: And here you agree with me, but I agree not with my self. If I can but so well accord with you, and others all along, I hope to be fairly reconciled to my self, and then we are all agreed.

1. How far this Promise belongeth to *God's Legislative Will*, and how far to his *Will de Eventu*, I fully told you my thoughts, *Append. p.* 43, 44. To which I need not add much more.

2. You know the chief part of my words there, are those which you leave out: I say, [*If that which expresseth the engagement of the Word, and Truth of God, to bestow good upon a man*, &c.] *Mere Prophecies* may *discover God's mind to do good*; and thence we may collect, that they shall certainly be fulfilled, because the Speaker is true. But they are not an *engaging of God's Word and Truth, to bestow good on any man, or Society*: For if they so *engage*, it is to some body, and to them it is a *Promise*.

3. These *Absolute Promises* are *directly Predictions*, and so belong to the Will of *Purpose*, or *de Eventu*: But, as is explained *Append. p.* 44. they

are

are also *Promises*, and therefore called by the Apostle, *a Covenant*; and so belong to the *Legislative Will.* There is nothing written in Scripture, but what belongs to *God's Law*, and respecteth Due one way or other: But then some parts are *essentially* and *directly* God's Law, and do directly determine of *Due*. Others do *directly* speak *de Eventu*, and do but indirectly speak *de Debito*; or it may be are but subservient to those parts which do speak *de Debito*, and so belong *Reductivè* to the Law; or are *Adjuncts* of it: And so are all Scripture-*Prophecies* and *Histories*; as in mens Laws, the Preamble and Historical Narratives of the Occasion of the Law, is an *Adjunct*, and in some sense a *part* of the Law.

4. There *are Promises* that *properly* belong not to the *Legislative Will*, nor do speak *de Debito*: The English word *Promise*, comprizeth all those three, or is applicable to them *all*; which *Grotius* mentioneth *de Jure Belli*, *l.* 2. *c.* 11. *p.* 210. 1. *Assertio explicans de futuro animum qui nunc est.* 2. *Pollicitatio, cum Voluntas seipsam pro futuro tempore determinat, cum signo sufficiente ad indicandam perseverandi necessitatem.* Neither of these, as such, belong to Law, or speak *de Debito Constitutivè*. But the *last* doth, which is, 3. *Promissio perfecta: ubi ad determinationem talem accedit signum Volendi Jus proprium alteri conferre, similem habens effectum qualem alienatio dominii. Est enim aut via ad alienationem rei, aut alienatio particulæ cujusdam nostræ libertatis. Illuc pertinent promissa dandi: huc promissa faciendi.*

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *Those Promises fall under the Will of Purpose, not of Precept.*

Animadvers.

It seems you take the word [*Precept*] very largely, and improperly. For otherwise it might seem superfluous to add this. For how should a mere absolute Promise fall under the Will of Precept? This were to make a *Precept* of a *Promise*.

Reply.

Did I not tell you, that I chuse to call it the *Legislative Will*, as extending it *ad Debitum præmii & pœnæ* as well as *ad Officium*, rather than by any other term? If I make any use of other mens terms, must I therefore be tied to their sense, contrary to that which I have fully expressed to be my own? But if you think that the Authors of that Distinction, or the uses, do so restrain it to *Precept*, how can you then think that they mean the same that I do?

Aphorism.

Page 15. *That this Life promised in the first Covenant, was only the continuance of that state that* Adam *was then in in Paradise, is the judgment of most Divines.*

Animadvers.

Whether most Divines be of this judgment or not, I will not enquire: By divers passages in your Book you seem to assent unto it, but so cannot I for these Reasons:

1. *Adam* by his Transgression became liable to the second Death: Therefore if he had been obedient, he had enjoyed the happiness of the life to come. For the Reward of Obedience should have (it's likely) held proportion with the punishment of Disobedience.

2. It seems incongruous, that a rational and understanding Creature, being perfectly righteous, and holy, and every way obedient, should always lead an Animal and Natural

life and never attain to greater happineſs than this life affords.

3. *Adam* perſevering in the ſtate of Innocency, ſhould have procreated Children, and his Children other Children, and ſo on. Therefore if *Adam* and his Poſterity ſhould always have lived upon the Earth, how, in an ordinary way of Providence, could the Earth have been able either to ſuſtain, or ſupport all that ever ſhould be born, all from the very firſt ſtill remaining, and more and more continually ſucceeding to all Eternity? If you ſay, that after ſome continuance of time, the Propagation of Mankind ſhould have ceaſed; *viz.* when the Earth was ſo full, that it could well bear no more: Where doth the Scripture warrant this conceit? Rather it intimateth, that many having lived ſome time upon Earth, ſhould have been tranſlated into Heaven.

For, 4. It ſeems that Paradiſe was a Type of Heaven, whither man, if he had kept his firſt eſtate, ſhould have been tranſlated: And that the Tree of Life was a Type of Eternal Life, *Rev.* 2. 7. & 22. 14. And though I like not to be peremptory in things of this nature, yet there may ſeem to be ſome probability in that opinion, which ſome of old have entertained; *viz.* That if man had not faln into Diſobedience, he ſhould have lived a thouſand years upon Earth, and then have been conveyed to Heaven. For though *Adam*, and divers of his Off-ſpring, lived many hundred years, yet neither he, nor any after him, did reach unto a thouſand. See Mr. *Mede*, p. 284. *Edit. Lat.*

Reply.

Here are two Queſtions to be conſidered: 1. Whether *Adam* ſhould have been tranſlated to Heaven by a *Local removal?* This is it that I ſaw no Scripture for, or convincing Reaſon, and therefore durſt not affirm, nor receive as certain. 2. Whether *Adam* ſhould have attained to a far higher degree of Happineſs in that Paradiſe he then was in, by God's fuller manifeſtation of himſelf to him, as to the Saints in Heaven: This I never denied, nor yet affirmed, nor medled with. And indeed, ſince I wrote that Book, I am grown to a greater doubtfulneſs

fulneſs of the whole; and will not now dare to affirm or deny either of the Queſtions. For I do not know ſo much as to make me any thing confident. I confeſs while I looked merely at expreſs Scripture-words, I was loth to affirm what Scripture affirmed not; and therefore inclined to the Negative of the firſt Queſtion. But ſince, upon the conſideration of the drift and reaſon of Scripture-Doctrine, I am much ſtaggered. And indeed, that which ſtaggered me was none of the common Arguments brought againſt M. *Ball*, *Gataker*, *Camero*, and the reſt that go that way that I then did; but the mere Conſiderations *de fine*, and how far it is Natural, and how far not, as I was ſeriouſly reading *Scotus*, *Rada*, and others, of that weighty, knotty ſubject. I dare not now be ſo bold, as to affirm, That *Adam* was created *in Patriâ*, and not *in Viâ*; that is, in the full fruition of his Happineſs; rather in the way to it, with an imperfect taſte of it. But eſpecially I am very jealous leſt I ſhould give advantage to Infidelity, and the denial of the Glory of the Saints in Heaven, if I ſhould go too far in aſſerting the Supernaturality of it. If *Adam* had not a *Potentia Naturalis* of ſuch a Beatitude, it would raiſe doubts whether *we have*; ſeeing he was as perfect *quoad Humanitatem* as we, and ſo potentially as capable

It is long ſince this was written, and ſince I have been fully convinced, that *Adam* was made for Heaven, that is, the Saints ſtate of Glory: 1. From the natural tendency of all the ſuperior faculties of the Soul. 2. From many Scripture-texts, which deſcribe *Redemption* in words importing our Reſtauration to a Bleſſedneſs which we loſt, as to the title and hopes of it. Therefore I hope my doubting then, will further no ones doubting.

capable of such a Blessedness: And if he had a *Potentia Naturalis* to it, then it would seem that it was not given him in vain; and that he had not attained the perfection that he was made for, if he had not attained all that he was made *Potentialiter* capable of. Some more such School-Reasons of late have staggered me in this, and made me most incline to think, that *Adam* should have had the same, or near the same degree of Glory as we. But yet I have much to say on the other side: However, I little know where he should have enjoyed it, or how removed to it, if removed. I must needs therefore confess my ignorance here, till God be pleased to remove it. But I confess I had before thought on your Reasons, and they seemed not cogent to me: For, 1. If by the second Death, you mean the same degree of Punishment which is due to the Despisers of Christ, I deny that *Adam* was liable to it: If you mean, the perpetuating of his Souls sufferings, I grant it: But all that will thence follow is, that his felicity should have been perpetuated, if he had not sinned. For it will not follow, that because *Adam* was to go to his perpetual Death, by the temporal Death which he had deserved, that therefore he was to go to Glory by a change, or removal. For the place where *Adam*'s Soul should have suffered, none knows it. And 2. God could encrease *Adam*'s happiness, without any removal by a fuller Manifestation of himself to him. How far the Life hereafter shall be Animal, or Natural, is scarce well known by us now; nor how far God might have removed *Adam*'s state from present imperfections, even in that Paradise. And, 3. It seems vain to put such a Question, How God should

should provide room for Mankind, and so to object difficulties to God; especially considering, that God knew there would be no place for such difficulties, seeing he had decreed to permit Mans fall. And, 4. It follows not, [Paradise was a Type of Heaven, therefore *Adam* should have been translated to Heaven.] Lastly, where, or what that Paradise was, little do I know.

Aphorism.

Page 15. *THe same Damnation that followeth the breach of the New-Covenant, it could not be (viz. which was threatned in the first) no more than the life then enjoyed, is the same with that which the New-Covenant promiseth.*

Animadvers.

You should say, [*No more than the life then promised is the same*, &c.] For otherwise your Comparison is not equal. Now to me it is more than probable, for the Reasons prealledged, That the Life promised in the first Covenant, was the same with that which the New-Covenant doth promise, and consequently, that the same Death and Damnation (for substance) is threatned in both Covenants. And do not many yet lie under the first Covenant, and that shall be punished merely as Transgressors of that Covenant, the New-Covenant having never so much as been made known unto them? See *Rom.* 2. 12. And shall not the Damnation of such, be (for substance) the same with the Damnation of those that transgress the New-Covenant? Shall not both go to the same Hell, and endure the same Torment, though not in the same degree? See 2 *Thess.* 1. 7, 8, 9.

In the *Append.* p. 10. you argue thus, [*If you say that* Adam *should have died, and rose again to Torment, what Scripture saith so? 2. Where should he have risen? 3. You contradict many Scriptures, which make Christ the Mediator the only Procurer of the Resurrection.*]

Answ. 1. The Scripture sheweth, that man transgressing the first Covenant, should die the first Death, *Gen.* 2. 17. and

3. 19. And not the first Death only, but also the second Death, if it be not prevented by that Mercy which is held out in the New-Covenant. *The wages of sin is death*, saith the Apostle, *Rom.* 6. 23. And the Death which he speaketh of, is opposed to etrenal Life, which is the free-gift of God, through Jesus Christ our Lord; and therefore it must extend to that which the Scripture calls the second Death. And seeing the Body is co-partner with the Soul in the Transgression, it is not probable that the first Covenant doth denounce the second Death only against the Soul, and not against the Body also, on which (after the Soul is separated from it) it cannot be inflicted without a Resurrection.

2. *Adam*, and so others, should have risen either (as now they shall) in the end of the World, or when it should have pleased God to raise them.

3. Though Christ as Mediator be now the only Procurer of the Resurrection, yet it follows not, that if Christ had not been Mediator, there should have been no Resurrection; no more than it doth follow, that then the Sentence of Damnation should not have been executed upon Transgressors. That which you cite in the *Aphor.* p. 30. from 1 *Cor.* 15. 12. & 21. 22. speaks only of *Resurrection unto Glory*, as is clear by *Vers.* 23. & 42, *&c.*

Reply.

I confess that I then supposed there was no other Life promised, than that which was enjoyed; and that the right to it was from *actual Collation*, and not by *Promise:* My Reason was, because I found no such Promise. And most Divines say, that the words of the *Commination implying* a *Promise*, are our proof that it was *a Covenant or Promise*. Now I found no Promise certainly implied in the words of the Commination, but the continuance of that Life which he had. For to say, [*Thou shalt die,*] implies indeed [*otherwise thou shalt not die:*] But no more.

I have shewed you now what makes me suspend * my judgment: And for your further Reason, [*That many lie under the first Covenant, that shall be punished merely as Transgressors of that Covenant, the New-Covenant having never been made known to them.* I reply far more confidently, that I am strongly perswaded you will never prove it while you live. I do not think that any man living, is now under the *mere Covenant of Works, as* Adam *was, Sine Fœdere novo, vel Gratiâ remediante.* Prove that God dealeth with any one on these terms now only, [*Obey perfectly, and live*;] or, [*If thou ever sin, thou shalt die everlastingly.*] I do affirm indeed, That men may be said to be under the Law of *Nature still*; but not *merely*, nor *alone*, as *Adam*, without *any Remedy*. I could well find in my heart to joyn issue on this point, and stay longer on it, but that it would be a Digression, being on so light a touch. Only thus much,

* And since resolved me.

1. The Covenant of Works doth not allow men (or God, according to that Covenant, doth not give men) such rich and numerous Mercies, as the poorest Indians do enjoy; therefore God dealeth not with them merely on the terms of the Covenant of Works.

2. The Mercies given, according to the mere Covenant of Works, are not given to *lead men to Repentance*; (for it alloweth *no Repentance*, but that of *Desperation*:) But the Mercies that Pagans have, are given to lead them to Repentance; therefore they are not given according to the mere Law of Works.

3. If Christ, as *Mediator*, shall *judg all*, then *all*

are some-way of that Kingdom whereof he is King, and under those Laws by which he ruleth: But, *&c.* therefore, *&c.* And therefore not under the mere Law of Works. The common Answer, [*That he will judg the Devils,*] is beside the business. He judgeth them as *Captives*, Enemies; but he judgeth all wicked men as *Rebellious Subjects*. It will not follow [He judgeth Foreign open Enemies as a Conqueror, and not as their King; therefore so he doth by Domestick Rebels:] All wicked men are Christ's *Subjects de Jure*, though not by *Consent de Facto*. They may have his *Mercies* also, though they know not *him:* As many are *God's Subjects*, and have *his Mercies* (as will be confessed) who yet *know not God.*

4. If all shall be judged at last, according to the well or ill-using of the Talents of Mercy, then not merely according the Law of Works: But the Antecedent is plain, *Mat.*25. *& Passim*; therefore, *&c.* No Scripture that I know of, doth once intimate, that God will say at last to any men, [*Go ye Cursed, because ye once sinned*;] or merely, [*because ye sinned,*] but because ye *sinned against Mercy that tended to Recovery.* But much more might easily be said to this.

Rom. 2.12. which you cite, hath not the least colour for your Assertion, that I can see. The Law was of narrower extent, as to its Promulgation and Obligation, than the Grace of the Mediator is: Where doth God say, *As many as have sinned without Mercy or Grace* (that is, *Mercy* contra Meritum) *shall perish without Mercy, or Grace?* That is it that you should prove. And as little is, 1. *Thess.* 1.7,8. to your purpose; which plainly speaketh of such as *obey*

not

not the Gospel, and *persecuted the Apostles:* Or if it had not; yet it speaks of none that partaked not of the Mercies of the Mediator.

To that you say against the passage in my *Append.* p. 10. I reply, *Adam* should have suffered *perpetual Misery* (call it first or second Death, as you please:) But your Conjecture at a Probability from the Bodies co-partnership, is no proof. Is it not as probable, that the Body being the Souls Instrument, and acted by it, that everlasting Dissolution should have been its punishment, its nature being also more subject to Dissolution than the Souls; and that Dissolution being a real and grievous punishment? Doubtless it would have been a *Privation of its Perfection*, and that for sin, and therefore a punishment; and the Soul that was chief in sin, to have suffered perpetually, according to its more durable nature. Philosophers commonly say, It is only the Soul that *feels*, and so *suffers now*, and not the *Body it self.* And if so, then the Body would not suffer pain hereafter, but only the *Soul* in that Body. But I am glad you seem not to be of *Twisse*'s opinion, that *Melius est Miserum esse, quam non esse*; or else you would not think it no punishment to the Body, to be for ever dissolved, while the Soul is tormented. But here I assert nothing, but only oppose Conjecture to Conjecture, waiting for your better proof, seeing you affirm. And,

2. Your second is a bare Affirmation, without one Scripture-proof, That *Adam* should have risen again. And,

3. But it follows, that seeing Scripture mentioneth no Resurrection but what is procured by Christ,

Christ, that therefore it is to us uncertain, whether there should have been any. And if all should have risen, whether Christ had died and risen or not; then how will it appear, that any mans Resurrection was purchased by Christ? For whereas you distinguish of Resurrection to Life and to Death, that is not *de Re*, but *de Consequente*. Indeed the *Life* following that Resurrection is then from Christ; But what need he procure a *Resurrection* for them which should rise *without his procurement?* And for the Text, 1 *Cor.* 15. 21, 22. I confess, the end of *Paul* was to confirm and comfort Believers; and therefore *vers.* 23. he applies it to them only: But it follows not therefore, that he speaks only of the Cause of *their* Resurrection. He seems to extend it to all that die in *Adam*; and many other Texts which I'le not now stand on, seem to say as much.

Aphorism.

Page 24. YEt *I doubt not*, Weems *his Interpretation is the plain truth that the words*, [From the foundation of the World] *have reference to the* [Writing of their names in the Book of Life] *and not to the slaying of the Lamb*, &c.

Animadvers.

So also Mr. *Mede* doth expound it: And the Explication is probable from *Rev.* 17. 8. But so also is the other Exposition from 1 *Pet.* 1. 19, 20.

Reply.

There is great difference between [*Fore-ordaining*] before the foundation of the World, and [*Slaying*] before it. However, as long as we are agreed of the matter of Doctrine in it, the matter is but small.

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Page 49. *IF we did perfectly obey the Law in Christ (or Christ for us) according to that strict* * Imputation, *then there is no use for suffering for disobedience.*

* What I mean by the Distinction of Imputation in *strict* and *large* sense, I must desire the Reader to see in Mr. *Bradshaw* of Justification, especially in the Epistle to the English Edition: For I hold the Imputation of Christ's Active Righteousness, as he doth, in the larger sense. See also my *Life of Faith*, and, *Appeals to the Light*, and, *Dispute of Imputed Righteousness*, since this written; besides my *Dispute of Justification*.

Animadvers.

Though I could never see any necessity of having Christ's *Active Righteousness imputed* to us, yet this Argument seems not forcible enough against it. For though we should perfectly obey the Law in Christ, that (I speak of obeying actively) seems not sufficient to satisfie for our disobedience in *Adam*, but that in that respect suffering should be requisite.

Reply.

Hitherto your difference with me is small, in comparison of our agreements. And seeing you yield, that according to that Doctrine [*of the strict Imputation of Christ's Active Righteousness*] there is no need of his Satisfaction for any sin, but only Original. I need not trouble my self and you in driving the Argument higher, there being enow more, and this Consequence sufficing to destroy the said Doctrine of strict Imputation. And withal, you must remember, that on your own Supposition (which is, that Christ obeyed not *nostro loco*, as we were in *Adam* before the fall, or in the fall; which is true) it followeth, That therefore Christ's Active Imputed Righteousness (were there such a thing in the

the sense opposed) would be no sufficient perfect Righteousness to us: For it would not cover our *unrighteousness Original*, but only *Actual*. But I doubt you will make men angry with you, as they are with me, for your denying *this Imputation of Active Righteousness*: And yet I deny it *less than you*. For I judg that even Christ's *Active Righteousness* is for us, and so imputed to us *quatenus Satisfactoria & quatenus Meritoria*; as Mr. *Bradshaw* hath well opened it.

2. Yet I think that Christ's Satisfaction is here by them made needless. For did not *Adam* himself obey perfectly in Christ, according to that Doctrine. And then what need had *Adam* of Christ's Satisfaction. And do they not say, that Christ's Obedience is imputed to us, as it is a perfect Obedience *pro omni tempore?* and if so, then it must be a cover to our first disobedience in *Adam*, as well as to all that follows.

Aphor.

Page 55. *THough the Sufferings of Christ have the chief place therein, yet his Obedience, as such, may also be Meritorious and Satisfactory.*

Animadvers.

You mean his Active Obedience: For there is also Passive Obedience, as well as Active.

Reply.

I do mean all *Obedience*, as *Obedience*: For I suppose you mean *Christ's Sufferings as Penal* (when you call them the *Satisfaction*, and exclude the *Active Righteousness*) and not directly as *Obedience*: Though, no doubt, they must not be separated from the consideration of their being *Voluntary* and *Obedi-*

Obedience. But to tell you my thoughts, I think the phrase of [*Passive Obedience*] is very dark, if you understand it in the same near sense as you do [*Active Obedience*:] For all Obedience is so called formally, in reference to some Law or Command of a Superior to which we obey. Now *Pœna*, or Suffering, is not the direct and proper matter of any Precept, as a Precept: The Law doth threaten Punishment, and not command it. Yet as Suffering is the remote matter, so it may be called, *Passive Obedience*; (that is, God commandeth us to submit to Sufferings.) Submission and Patience is the direct matter of Obedience; and Suffering the *Remote*: And therefore I will not quarrel with the phrase of [*Passive Obedience.*]

Aphorism.

Page 56. AND *so* Rom. 5. 19. *By the Obedience of one, many are made righteous.*

Animadvers.

That place will evince nothing for you, because it may, and probably should be interpreted of Obedience by Suffering. *He humbled himself, and became obedient unto death*, &c. Phil. 2.8.

Reply.

1. But it seems to speak of *Obedience*, as *Obedience*: And then it is not much matter, whether the *matter* of it be *doing*, or *suffering*. For in Christ's *suffering*, if it were not only his *suffering*, as suffering or *Penalty*, but also as *Obedience*, which was *Satisfactory*: Then why may not his *Active Obedience*, as *Obedience*, also be *Satisfactory*? For *à quatenus ad omne valet consequentia*. However, there is the same *formal Nature* of *Obedience* in *Active Obedience*, as is in *Passive*. Nay, even *Passive Obedience* is

is more properly and *nearly Active*; and but *improperly* and *remotely Passive*. For the Act of *Willing Submission*, is that which is commanded, and is the *materia proxima & propria* of Obedience: The *Penalty* (as I said even now) is not commanded directly and properly, but threatned: And the pain, as pain, is but remotely the matter of Obedience, as the Object of our Patience.

2. And *Rom.* 5.19. seemeth to include *Active Obedience*, as well as *Passive:* For it seems to intimate *such Obedience* as is opposed to *Adam's Disobedience*. However, it is such as is opposed to Disobedience in general, and therefore it is (as I said) Obedience *qua talis*, and not as Suffering.

Aphorism.

Page 58. *Some Works he performed, which were our duty indeed; but he was not bound to perform them in regard of himself: Such were all the Observances of the Ceremonial Law*, &c.

Animadvers.

Christ taking upon him the form of a Servant, and being made under the Law, I see not but he was bound in all things to obey the Will of God, and to observe his Law.

Reply.

* *Paraus* I suppose was as much as most against the Active Righteousness, as such, being the matter of our Righteousness; and yet he concludeth, that *Quicquid deniq; fecit & passus est ad quod ipse, tanquam Dei filius, non fuit obligatus, est Satisfactio ejus, quam pro nobis præstitit, & justitia qua nobis credentibus à Deo gratis imputatur. Ea enim Satisfactio æqui pollet vel impletioni Legis per obedientiam, vel pœnæ æternæ propter peccata; ad quorum alterutrum nos lege obligamur.* Ursin. Cat. q. 60. art. 4. p. 352. I take it as *Paraus* his judgment, as well as *Ursine's*.

* No doubt of that: But, 1. The doubt is, Whether it were the Will of God, that

any

any but sinners should be obliged by his Law to use those Ceremonies, which in their nature imply the Users to be sinners, and intimate a confession of sin, in ordinary performers; and in their end do tend to recovery from sin? And indeed, Christ did not perform these to the same ends as sinners did, and as they were mainly intended for such in their Institution.

2. I said he was not bound to perform them [*in regard of himself*:] that is, [*finaliter*, he was no sinner, and had no sin to pardon of his own, nor any sinful wants to be supplied; and so had not those ends of his own to move or necessitate him to use them, as others had:] But he used them, both to shew his subjection, and take up that burthen of tedious Ceremonious-Worship, which justly lay on us; and also to give us an example, *&c.*

3. It hence therefore follows, that seeing he used the actions (as Circumcision, Offerings, *&c.*) separated from their Legal ends, to other ends of his own, that his primary obligation to them was *ex vi sponsionis propriæ* (as was all his obligation to suffer) and not *ex Lege*; (For else the Law would have obliged him to the Act and End together.) And then the Law did after oblige him upon his subjecting, and submitting himself voluntarily thereto; and that but limitedly and in part, so far as he submitted to it; that is, to the *same Action*, but not for the *same Ends*: Because it could not oblige him beyond that his undertaking, and voluntary submission. So that I conceive, if Christ had stood before God, only in the person of God-man in Righteousness, he should have been obliged only to obey those Laws which belong to the Righteous, and have nothing either

either in the end of them, or burdensomness of them, which proceedeth from sin: But seeing Christ undertook to be in that low condition, and bear all that burden of *pœnal Actions*, and *direct Sufferings* which sinners had subjected themselves to by sin; therefore he would be *made under the Law*, and so undertake those Legal performances. And therefore it is in *respect of us*; as the *Undertaker of our burden*, that he used them; who otherwise, in respect *of himself* (though supposing him man) being perfectly righteous, should not have been obliged to those duties that were ordained for sinners, as sinners. This is my meaning: But for the thing, it being of no greater moment, I leave it to your better judgment, and will not contend.

Aphorism.

Page 59. *YEt when he voluntarily put himself in the state of a servant, and under the Law, not for his own sake, but for ours, his Work is nevertheless Meritorious.*

Animadvers.

Christ putting himself in the state of a servant, and under the Law, though voluntarily, yet now his Obedience is necessary: For it is necessary that the Creature should be obedient to the Creator.

2. Hence it follows, That not Christ's Active Righteousness, *as such* (as you affirm, *page* 54, & 55.) but in respect of his Condescension to that *low estate*, is part of his *Satisfaction.*

Reply.

This is the main thing that (in this point of Satisfaction) I differ from you in. I think (and that somewhat confidently) that his after-subjection, and the after-necessity of his Obedience, do not

at

ll evacuate or diminish the Meritoriousness of his Actions: Because that Necessity is an assumed, and not an *aliunde*-imposed necessity. And God is not injust, to forget the state that the Subject was in while he was free; nor to separate in his Consideration and Valuation the after-action, from the former free-Engagement, and the Dignity and Freedom of the Person then engaging. If I being a Free-man, do bind my self to be your Servant, or your slave (I mean to be absolutely at your command *quoad actiones serviles*) on Condition that you give me for my service 20 *l. per annum*: Doth my service deserve none of this wages after, because I being once bound, my service is necessary? And remember, that thus Christ became bound by *quasi-Contract*, and so *Conditionally*; and the Condition was, That his service should be accepted as Meritorious and Satisfactory, towards the Recovery of sinners. To say therefore, That his Service, or Actions ceased to be *Meritorious*; is either to say, They lost their Dignity (which may not be imagined;) or God ceased or failed to accept them as Meritorious and Satisfactory, and so broke his Covenant (as we may call it) which is as little to be imagined. *Jacob*'s service (as service, and not only as suffering) deserved *Leah* and *Rachel*, &c. nevertheless because he became bound to serve. Nay more, among just men, it is not only the wages agreed on by Covenants, that is deserved by a painful servant; but if he do much more, and so benefit his Master more, he doth truly deserve more, and the just Master will pay him more; though not by virtue of the Obligation of the Covenant, yet by virtue of the Obligation of the Law of Nature,

which is before it: So great is the difference between the service of one that doth voluntarily oblige himself, when he was *sui juris*; and one that is originally under your absolute Dominion: The one may sell you his service before-hand, according to its value, which supposeth the future reality of that value and merit; but the other cannot, because he, and all that is his, is properly not his own, but yours.

Add to this what I before told you, that the Godhead was never subjected (either as to *Propriety*, *ad Dominum*; or to *Obedience*, *ad Rectorem*) in it self, but only it may by *Communication* be *called subject*: And therefore the Actions of Christ, receiving their *chief Dignity* from his *chief Nature*, which was never *in it self subject*, must needs be highly *Meritorious*; both, 1. Because of the Dignity. 2. And of the Freedom of that Nature.

2. And therefore I utterly deny your Consequence on these grounds, and affirm still, That Christ's *Active Righteousness, or Obedience, as such, is Meritorious and Satisfactory.* And indeed, the Question should rather be, *Whether it be only* Pœna Christi, *or* Obedientia *also, that satisfieth and meriteth:* (as I before hinted.)

Aphorism.

Page 60. *EVen some Works that are Due, may yet be so excellent, that they may give Satisfaction for former injuries*, &c.

Animadverf.

I see not how Works which are otherwise due, can properly be Meritorious or Satisfactory. This seems repugnant to that of our Saviour, Luke 17. 10. *When you have done all things that are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants, we have done but what our duty was to do.*

Reply.

Reply.

1. We must distinguish of the *Obligation* or *Cause* of the dueness. 2. And of the *Relation* in which we consider the parties.

See Bishop *Usher*'s Catechism, affirming the Obedience of Christ to be part of his Satisfaction to the first Covenant.

1. If the *Obligation* be merely imposed, *per absolutum Dominum*, then you may carry it your way: But where the *Obligation* is *Self-imposed* or *assumed*, or caused by *Conditional Contract*, and the Condition of this Contract doth express or imply the Acceptation of the Work, as Meritorious or Satisfactory; there (as is said) the case is plain against you.

2. But suppose it were not so: Yet, 1. Though it be granted, that I cannot merit of an *equal*, by doing *my duty*; 2. Nor yet of an *Absolute Lord*, as such: 3. Yet of a *Rector qua talis*, I may. Not that the Reward is due to me *in sensu absoluto & simpliciter*. But 1. *Comparatè & secundum quid* it is. For a *Rector* is obliged to make a difference between the most *perfectly obedient* Subjects, and that do eminent service for the Commonwealth; and the *disobedient*, or less profitable, and that by rewarding and encouraging the obedient and useful. 2. And this is due principally to the *Common Good*, and to the *end of Government*: And so the Obligation seems to be *a fine ad Media*, and prudential. I have told you in the Aphorism, that I will not differ with you, if you call this (Merit of Governing, and not Commutative Justice) but *Merit impropriè & secundum quid*.

Yet, though this be less properly [*Merit*] where

it is mixt with sinful demerits that may cloud it, it is *more properly Merit*, where the Obedience and Serviceableness to the Common-Good is absolutely perfect; as in Christ it was.

Aphorism.

Page 61. *THE Interest of the Divine Nature in all the Works of Christ, maketh them to be infinitely Meritorious, and so satisfactory.*

Animadverf.

Viz. Because it is an Infinite Condescension of the Person so partaking of the Divine Nature to do such Works; *viz.* Of Active Obedience (for of such I suppose you mean) so that still, not properly Christ's Active Obedience, simply considered, but his Condescension is Meritorious, and so Satisfactory.

Reply.

1. If the Interest of the Divine Nature do put a value on the *Penalty* as such, or on the *Condescension* as such, then also on the *Obedience*, or *Good Actions* as such; (for there is *eadem ratio*:) But the former you grant; therefore, *&c.*

2. If Christ's *Condescension* become *Meritorious* by the Interest of the Godhead, then his *Active Obedience* doth so: (If you mean that *Condescension*, not only as at his *first Undertaking*, but as manifested and exercised in the performance:) For his Condescension (so taken) is his *Active Obedience*; *Condescendere ad pœnam ferendam*, is *Consentire ad pœnam aliter indebitam ferendam*, and so not to murmur or resist. And this is somewhat antecedent to the Suffering it self. (Both *Agere & Actionem sustendere*, belong to that which we call Active Obedience, as distinct from Passive; and therefore which-soever you instance in, it comes all to one.)

3. What

3. What if I should prove to you, that *no suffering*, either *as suffering*, or as *punishment* can *merit*? It may *satisfie*, but whether it can *merit*, consider these things. If it *merit*, it must be either for the *innate excellency* of the *thing*, or for the *ends obtained*, or benefits received by it, by him from whom it so meriteth. In the former sence, it can merit but an acknowledgment, and estimation, and praise. And thus *pœna qua pœna non meretur*: 1. Because as it is *in patiente*, it is *malum & non bonum*. 2. It is *involuntarium quid*; and therefore *not meritorious*.

Object. *It was voluntary to Christ.*

Answ. Only *indirectè*, *secundum quid*, *ad finem ulteriorem*: But *pœna qua pœna*, he naturally continued to *Nill*: His Nature was against it; and his Will naturally, as it was *malum sibi*: And therefore he prayed, that *the Cup might pass &c.* yet *submitted* to it, at his Fathers will and his own. So that it was properly a *willing* of the *end*, but the *penalty* was more properly *submitted to* than *willed*; yet not as *pœna*, *vel malum*, but as *medium ad finem optimum*. And then, that Good that Punishment hath, is as it is *à puniente*, *& in effectu*; and so it is the *Punisher* that *meriteth* for his *Justice*; and not the *punished* for *Suffering*.

Further, it hath no virtuous Moral Goodness in it, as it is in the Sufferer: For all such Goodness is the *materia Præcepti*, *& non Comminationis*. The Preceptive part of the Law only doth constitute the *debitum officii*, and so the *moral Goodness*: But *pœna qua pœna non præcipitur*.

2. And if you say, That it is for its *Ends* or *Consequences*, that *pœna meretur*.

I answer, 1. So the *Punisher*, or the *punished* meriteth. The question is only of the *punished*. And whatever good followeth: 1. If the punishment be deserved by himself. 2. Or involuntary, no thanks is due to him, he merits nothing. And therefore *pœna culpæ propriæ* cannot be meritorious. And therefore it was *in Christ* primarily and directly, his *Obediential and Voluntary submitting* to such a penalty, which being not for his own faults, did yet tend to such excellent ends, which made it meritorious. Take all plainly in this one word as the sum. Christ's *sufferings*, as *sufferings*, were not the *immediate matter* of his *merit*; but his *Willingness* the *immediate*, and the *suffering-willed* was the *remote*. His *sufferings* were *first in order Satisfactory*, and after that *remotely Meritorious*; and therefore *Meritorious*, because first Satisfactory: But his *Active Obedience* (or to speak more properly, his *obedience*, as *obedience*, or good-works) was first *Meritorious* (in order of Nature) and then *Satisfactory*; and therefore *Satisfactory*, because *first Meritorious*. Only further consider, Christ's Works have a double merit: One of *God's Acceptance*, and that he be well pleased with them, and ready to reward them in general: This goeth before their *Satisfactoriness*, and is it that I mean: The other is their merit of a *particular benefit* of *Pardon*, *Justification*, &c. for us sinners: This followeth after their *Satisfactoriness*. But in Christ's suffering, there is no *innate merit* (because no goodness) *as suffering*; but only as a *Satisfactory suffering*, conducing to those excellent ends which *quatenus satisfactio* it attaineth: So that punishment, as punishment, or suffering, merits not at all; but all Merit lieth in two things:

Mate-

Materialiter, 1. *In rei dignitate, vel utilitate, ad alium.* 2. *In voluntate agentis:* It is therefore Christ's obedience, and his suffering as voluntary, and conducible to those high and noble ends, and also as the matter (as it were, of the Contract between the Father and Son) which is the Meritorious matter.

Aphorism.

Page 65. AND *so God having parted with that advantage which his Justice had against the sinning World, and having relaxed the Law whereby he might have judged; is therefore said to judg no man, but to give all judgment to the Son,* John 5. 22, 27.

Animadvers.

God hath not so committed all judgment to Christ, but that he also will judg, though by Christ, *Rom.* 2. 5, 6. *Acts* 17. 30, 31. that therefore in *John* 5. 22. is to be understood, that he judgeth no man immediately by himself, but hath committed all judgment to the Son; *i. e.* that the immediate execution of judgment should be from him: Or as *Austin* expounds it, *Secundum hoc dictum est (sc. omne judicium dedit filio) quòd in judicio non in forma Dei, sed in forma hominis apparebit.* This is intimated, *vers.* 27. and hath given him Authority to execute judgment, because he is the Son of Man; *viz.* Because so he is meet to execute judgment in an outward and visible manner, so that every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him, *Revel.* 1. 7.

Reply.

1. The Text contains *some kind* of exclusion of God the Father, [*The Father judgeth no man:*] An *utter exclusion* it cannot be, nor an exclusion of the Person or Essence; therefore it must be an exclusion of him in a *certain respect.* Now your Interpretation containeth *no exclusion*: For to say, [*he judgeth not immediately,*] is to include the *Mediant*, but not

to exclude God: As to say, [*he judgeth not alone,*] is to *include* an *Associate*, but not to *exclude himself.*

2. And were it otherwise, how will that agree with our common Doctrine, that [though God may *uti mediis*, yet he doth in, and by, and with them, *agere immediatè in omni actione, & immediatione Virtutis & suppositi?*

3. But yet I never contradicted your Interpretation of the Text, as part of the Truth, but it plainly seems to me to be but part; and the Reason you alledge seems to be defective. For no doubt, God could have judged the World by convenient, sensible Manifestation of his Presence, Power, Justice, *&c.* as he did in sentencing *Adam* when he had sinned.

But I think the Text means plainly, that God as mere Legislator of the Law of Works, judgeth no man, but hath given all judgment to the Son, as Redeemer and Legislator of, or Judg according to a Law of Grace, or on terms of Grace. It is not now *Deus-Creator secundum fœdus operum solum, sine Remedio: Sed Deus-Redemptor.* I think I could give you good proofs of this Interpretation.

1. The following words (which I think you misinterpret) seem to me to confirm it [*Because he is the Son of Man*;] that is, Because he is the *Incarnate Redeemer* or *Mediator*, and so because it belongs to his *Office*; and not merely, because he hath *flesh* or *Humane Nature.*

2. If his Dominion over the dead and living, were the end of his Dying, Rising and Reviving, and so was thereby procured, then so was his power of judging (and consequently belongeth to his

his Office, or to Christ as *Mediator*, and not *merely* as being Man: But the former is certain, *Rom.* 14. 9. therefore so is the latter.

3. If as Redeemer or Mediator, he be the rightful *King of all men*, then he shall be the *Judg of all men*, as Mediator or Redeemer; (For it belongeth to his *Kingly* Office to judge, and appoint Judges:) But the former is certain, as I could shew by multitudes of Scriptures. Though *quoad consensum & voluntariam subjectionem*, only the *Church* be Christ's Kingdom; yet *de Jure*, he is King of all the World, and he doth over-rule them, and partly rule them (for the very Law of Nature now is his Law) and that *ut Deus Redemptor & misericors*: They are not ruled merely *per Deum Creatorem*, unappeased and implacable for the breach of the first Law. They that deny this, will have a hard task to justifie all the Wicked or Pagan World at last, as not-guilty of sinning *contra Deum Redemptorem*, *vel misericordem*: (For he sheweth *not Mercy* according to the tenor of the first Law.)

4. If he condemn men at last for not taking him as their *King to Reign over them*; or for not improving the Talents of his Mercy, then he judgeth them *ex Officio*, as their rightful King: But the former is clear, *Luke* 19. 27. *Matth.* 25, &c. If any think those Texts reach but to those that have heard the Gospel; I think it reacheth as far as this, and to all that have received Talents of Mercy: But that is a subject that I may not now digress to take in.

5. The Scripture fully expresseth it, to be an act of *Christ's power received by him as the Mediator*, and so belonging to his *Office*; therefore only given him as *Incarnate*, or as accommodated with a Humane

mane Nature, *Matth.* 28. *All power in Heaven and Earth, is given to me*; therefore the power of *judging* the World: And this is given to him as *Mediator*, and on his Purchase, as the Text plainly intimateth, and *Rom.*14.9. fully expresseth. *Rev.* 1.18. *He hath the keys of Death and Hell.* There is comprehended the power of judging: And to have these keys, is undeniably belonging to his Office. But I pass over much more.

And *Calvin* saith, that *Judicium pro Imperio ac Potestate accipit Evangelista*, John 5.22. *Secundum phrasin linguæ Hæbraicæ & nunc firmum tenemus, quod traditum sit Christo Regnum à Patre, ut Arbitrio suo cœlum ac terram moderetur. Nam omnia tradita sunt illi à Patre* (saith *Marlorate*) Matth. 11.27. *& data est ei omnis potestas*, Matth. 28.18. And therefore if this be *Christ's Kingdom*, it must needs be his *Mediatory Office.*

And indeed the whole context, *Vers.* 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, *&c.* shew that it is a great part of Christ's Mediatory Office that is here expressed. And on *Vers.* 27. saith *Calvin, Iterum repetit datum sibi fuisse Imperium à Patre, ut plenam & in cælo & in terrâ rerum omnium potestatem habeat,* ἐξουσία *hic dignitatem significat: Judicium verò pro Regimine & Imperio accipitur. Ac si diceret, constitutum esse filium Regem à Patre, qui Mundum gubernet atq; exerceat Patris ipsius potestatem.* So also *Diodate* on the Text, *vers.* 27. [*To execute Judgment*;] *namely, to rule and govern*, vers. 22. [*because he is the Son of Man*;] not only in quality of true everlasting God, but also *of Mediator*, having taken Humane flesh upon him, *Acts* 17.31. 1 *Cor.* 15.28. in which Nature also he is the Fathers Grand-deputy, *Dan.*7.13.

And

And *Grotius* in *v.* 22. *Judicare Mundum Dei est, &c. sed nunc judiciariam potestatem filio dedit,* Acts 17. 31. 1 Pet. 4.5. *Nempe ubi ipsum Regem constituet,* Apoc. 1.5. *Nam Regum est judicare,* Psal.72.1. &c. *Et illud θεὸν recte forte accipias de his quibus Evangelium prædicatum est, &c.* Whether that be right or not, it seems he thought it was Christ's *Mediatory official judgment* that is here meant, and not only his *Deputation* in general. *Vid. eundem* in. *vers.*27, &c. and in *Matth.* 25.32. So *Pelargus* in *Matth.* 25. 31. *part.* 3. expounds this Text, *Christo datum esse judicium quatenus filius hominis notum est ex* Joh. 5.22. *quia vero judicem universalem contra tot iniquos judices & mundi principes armatum esse oportet, &c.* And *Paræus* in *Matth.* 25. 31. *Ipse enim constitutus à Deo judex vivorum & mortuorum; quia Pater omne judicium dedit filio, &c.* And no doubt the Judgment there described, is by Christ as *Lord-Redeemer* in his *Kingly Office*, and not merely because his *Humanity* fitteth him to be the Fathers *Delegate quoad executionem.*

Aphorism.

Page 67. *THe suspending of the rigorous Execution of the Sentence of the Law, is the most immediate effect of Christ's death.*

Animadvers.

Though Christ had not died, yet the rigorous execution of the Law (for any thing I see) should have been suspended. For if death had been immediately inflicted on *Adam*, how could Mankind have been propagated by him? [The immediate execution of the full sentence of the Law upon *Adam*, would have prevented the Being, the Sin, and the Suffering of his Posterity;] as your self argues against it, *page* 33.

Reply.

Reply.

1. The *present death* of *Adam* would not have been the *rigorous execution of the Law*; (for the Reasons alledged.) How can you call that the *Rigorous execution*, which would have prevented all the following *sins* of *Adam* himself, and all the sin and suffering of his Posterity? Do not you in your Rabbinical Commentary, mention their Exposition of *Morieris*, to be *Reus eris Mortis? &c.* And before out of *Mede*, you make the time to be [*a thousand years*] that *Adam* should have lived: And you may as probably say so of [*the day*] that death was threatned him, that it was a shortening of that time.

2. If we should speak of God, as of man, that must have time for his Consultations (which is not so;) and so that while he was consulting of the terms and way of our Redemption, he should in mere mercy suspend the execution: Yet, 1. That is not the Suspension that I now speak of. 2. Nor is that without respect to Redemption, but in order to it (if there were such a thing;) much less do I mean a continuance of a sinful miserable life, which is a preparative to greater punishments, which is rather the *execution* of the Sentence, than the *suspension*: But I mean all that which is *properly a suspension*, following Christ's *interposition and undertaking:* That God doth not while they live give them over to as much sinfulness and misery as they deserve, and as far abdicate them, and desert them by the withdrawing of all that may abate their misery, and that he gives them not over as forsaken to despair, and their lives on earth did not presently begin to be a Hell. If wicked men are freed from deserved misery,

misery, and that in a way in it self, tending to their full recovery (but that they wickedly frustrate it) without any procurement of the Mediator, then it seems God can relax his Law, and forbear the full execution, and confer Grace; (*i. e.* Mercy against desert) without *Satisfaction*; which though Dr. *Twiss* affirms, most others do deny. Could I stand on it, I take it to be no hard matter however to prove, that *de Facto* God sheweth no man such Mercies but through Christ.

Aphorism.

NOw they are only Afflictions of love, and not punishments.

Animadvers.

They are not so contradistinct, but that they may be co-incident. Some punishments may be afflictions of love; *viz.* Such as are for the correcting, purging, and reforming of the party punished. Castigatory punishments are Afflictions of love; *Whom I love, I rebuke and chasten*, Rev. 3. 19. *Whom the Lord loveth, he chasteneth*, Heb. 12. 6. Some indeed (not only Antinomians, but others also) seem to make Chastisements no judgments or punishments; but the Scripture is clear against them: *When we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord*, &c. 1 Cor. 11. 32. *I will correct thee in measure, yet will I not leave thee wholly unpunished*, Jer. 46. 28.

Reply.

1. You are a favourable Animadverter, who so ordinarily take my part, and defend what I say, under the name of Animadversion. You say as much as I; and in these words have fully expressed the sum of my sense. Only once or twice I carelessly, in compliance with the common Language, use the term [Affliction,] for [Chastisement;] which is all the occasion of exception that I yet see.

2. But

2. But it was a great overſight in you, to impute the alledged opinion or words of thoſe that I oppoſe, to me, as if they were mine. Theſe are my words, [*The common judgment is, That Chriſt hath taken away the whole Curſe (though not the ſuffering) by bearing it himſelf; and now they are only afflictions of love, and not puniſhments. I do not contradict this Doctrine through affectation of ſingularity, but conſtraint of judgment*, &c.] Had it not been very eaſie to know that thoſe are not my words or opinion, which I ſo profeſſedly oppoſe? The ſame which you ſay *ſome*, [*not Antinomians*] hold, I called [*the common judgment*:] For indeed *Peter Martyr*, *Zanchius*, and multitudes of others againſt the Papiſts, beſides late Engliſh Writers, commonly ſay ſo. But yet we have very many accurate Divines that ſay as much as I, and contradict them, as you do: And ſometimes they contradict themſelves. My full ſcope therefore is to prove, that *Chaſtiſements* are a *ſpecies* of *Puniſhment*.

Aphoriſm.

Ibid. IT *is undeniable, that Chriſt taking the Curſe on himſelf, did not* wholly *prevent the execution on the Offender*, Gen. 3.7,8,10,15. *&c.*

Animadverſ.

Though thoſe things that befal the Children of God be in their nature evil, and a curſe, yet to them they are not ſuch, becauſe they are ſanctified to them, and made to work together for their good, *Rom.* 8.28. 1 *Cor.* 11.32. *Phil.* 1.22. Poyſon being ſo tempered, as to be an Antidote, is no Poyſon, but a Remedy. Bleſſings to the wicked, become curſes; ſo curſes to the godly, prove bleſſings, *Pſal.* 119.71.

Reply.

Reply.

Omne malum est alicui malum: Aut igitur infligenti, aut patienti: At non infligenti; ergo patienti: If they be *Pœnæ*, they are *malum Pœnæ:* for *Bonum qua tale non est Pœna.* But you say (out of Scripture) they are *punishments.* If you will denominate the whole Work from the sole prevalent respect, effect and end, then they are to be called *Blessings:* God's heavy Judgments on *David* for his sin, was not *malum Pœnæ*, but a *Blessing*; so you mean, I doubt not: And so I agree with you in sense. But if (as you should) you keep still a distinct conception of their *penal Nature*, and their *accidentally* procured *Effect:* Then in regard of the former, you must still say, they are *mala Pœnæ*; and in regard of the latter, they are Paternal Love-tokens.

Aphorism.

Page 70. *They are ascribed to God's anger.*

Animadvers.

But not to his hatred. Anger may consist with *hatred. There is Castigatory Anger, as well as Vindicatory, *Isa.* 57. 17, 18.

* *It should be Love I think.*

Reply.

I have little Reason to quarrel with you, when you say as I, and almost repeat my words.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *They are called Punishments,* &c.

Animadvers.

Why then do you distinguish them from Punishments, *p.* 68. *Afflictions of Love, and not Punishments:* They are (as I have shewed)

shewed) Castigatory Punishments, but not Vindicatory, or Satisfactory.

Reply.

Why do *you say*, I so distinguish them? merely because I tell you, that I oppose them that do so? I had rather you had made me the Author of your own words, because you and I are both of a mind. But this I know was your oversight in reading, and therefore I pass it.

Aphorism.

Ib. *The very nature of* * *Affliction, is to be a loving Punishment*, &c.

* Chastisement.

Animadver.

1. This is not consistent with your other words even now cited, wherein you make Afflictions of Love and Punishments contradistinct one to the other.

2. Neither is it true in it self. For are no afflictions incident to the Reprobates? or are they loving Punishments, and sanctified to them?

Reply.

1. You should have said, It is not consistent with the words and Doctrine which I oppose; and that's no wonder.

2. I confest before, that here I put the word [*Afflictions*] instead of [*Chastisements*;] which I will not excuse, though custom may easily make it intelligible: For that Language is not singular. If therefore you mean it of Afflictions in general, I doubt not but they are more incident to the Reprobates than any; or else they should not be damned. If you mean it of [*Chastisements*,] I answer, 1. As God in a larger sence may be called the Father of all those to whom he sheweth mercy, provideth for them, beareth with them, offereth them Christ,

and

and Grace, giveth them in his Covenant of Grace a conditional Adoption; and so far he may be called the Father of Mankind, or of Reprobates (as many Divines on the Preface of the Lord's Prayer:) And so far he may be said to love them, and to chastise them. But not in that strict sence, as he is the Father of Believers, and loveth and chastiseth them.

2. So far as God *doth good* to Reprobates, he loveth them. But he doth them good, he giveth them mercy. Else they never sin against mercy, which who dare say? therefore they may partake of loving punishments; no doubt punishments may do them good.

3. Yet will I not say, that these are *sanctified* to them. As if there were *no good* below that of *Sanctification*: But if you will needs extend the word [*sanctified*] to *all good*, I contend not. But till God lay by his Philanthropy, I will not say, he loves not all men, at least, in this life.

4. And if you had put the case of [*Unbelievers*,] and not only of [*Reprobates*] it might easily have appeared, that they are *loving punishments* to *many Unbelievers*; *viz.* to the Elect before Conversion (as *Paul*'s striking down by the way, and *Manasseh*'s chains were, *&c.*) for they are means of their Conversion; and in some sence may be said to be sanctified to them, and in another not. And yet God is not then strictly their Father (for they are not adopted till they receive Christ by Faith, *John* 1. 10,11.) and therefore they are not so fatherly Chastisements. Where also you see, that it is not Christ's mere bearing the Curse for men, that makes it no Curse, or evil to them: For it is evil

and a Curse to many of the Elect, before Conversion, for whom yet Christ died.

Aphorism.

THerefore to say; that Christ hath taken away the Curse and Evil, and not the Suffering, is a contradiction.

Animadvers.

Not so, seeing suffering, though sanctified, is suffering still; but so is it not still evil and a curse, because now it works for the good of those to whom it is sanctified; even as bitter pills and potions work for the good of sick persons.

Reply.

1. By [*Curse*] I mean, only the *effect of the Commination of the Law of Nature violated*, commonly called [*the Curse:*] I do not mean that which makes a man so unhappy, as we use to call men [*Cursed*] for.

2. If sanctified suffering be not still *malum*, then it is not *malum pœnæ*; and then it is not *pœna* [which is a *natural evil inflicted for the defect of Moral good*:] But you maintain it to be *pœna*.

3. It's a natural evil effecting accidentally a greater Good. Here it remains still a *natural evil* when sanctified. The sanctifying takes not away all the *natural evil*; but by a less evil preventeth a greater. Death is not *bonum naturale*, because *sanctified*. Pain is pain still, *& malum vel disconveniens naturæ*, and *punishment* still: The *good* is *accidental* to the punishment, and therefore makes it nevertheless to be *pœna, vel malum per se*, though at the same time it be by accident *majus bonum*. What is it that is accidentally good? is it not *malum pœnæ?* If so, it remaineth *malum pœnæ* still, or else you cannot say that *malum pœnæ* is accidentally good. And when

all

all is done, it is but an improper speech to say, that *Death* and *Pain* are *good*, because they are *accidentally* made the *means* of our good. The goodness is properly in their *end*, and *accidental effect* (and the Sanctifier) rather than in them: And therefore they are more properly said to be *submitted* to for the good that followeth them, than *desired* or *loved*: It is not *Pain*, or *Death*; but *Grace* and *God* that I must *love*. Whereas, were they *good* indeed themselves, they might be *loved* themselves.

I do leave out the far greatest part of the Explication of my meaning on this subject, because I did it lately and largely on the Animadversions of another Learned Brother; and I am backward to repetitions, because it is most for my own information that I examine your Animadversions.

I will not contend with you about these phrases; but only I would advise you, that you take heed of arguing thus: That which works for our good is sanctified to us, and so is no more evil: But sin worketh to our good; therefore it is sanctified, and is no more evil, but good.

Aphorism.

WHat Reason can be given, why God should not do us all that good without our sufferings, which now he doth by them, if there were not sin and wrath, and Law in them.

Animadvers.

1. Indeed if there were no sin, there should be no affliction; as if there were no sickness, there should be no medicine: Yet is not the *Medicine evil*, and a curse to the sick; neither is affliction to God's children.

2. The Scripture doth shew us other reasons of our suffering; as, to conform us to *Christ*, Rom. 8. 29. with 17. to try us, 1 *Pet.* 4. 12. *Rev.* 2. 10. & 3. 10. and for the manifestation of God's glory, *John* 9. 3.

Reply.

1. An over seeing Answer. The *Question* is of sins interest as the *efficient meritorious Cause*: The *Answer* is of sin as the *terminus amovendus*, or *privatio finis*. We do not differ in that, Whether the *curing of sin* be the *end of Chastisement?* but where it is so, yet, Whether *sin* be not the *meritorious Cause*, so far as it is *evil?* You might better have instanced in *Chastisement*, than *medicining* of Children. No wise Father chastiseth his Child, but his *fault* is the *meritorious Cause*, as well as the *final (Reductive)* (his *Reformation* I mean.) You might therefore as truly have said, [There would be no Chastisement, if there were no *sin meriting* it,] as, [If there be no sin to be *cured by* it.] It is *essential* to *Punishment* (of which *Chastisement* is a *species*) that it be [*for sin as the meritorious Cause, really or supposed.*]

2. Your other assigned Reasons therefore are no Reasons; for they belong to the *final Cause*, and not to the *efficient*. And you do but leave me to renew my Question, What reason can you give, why God should have attained all those good ends (our Tryal, Conformity, his Glory, *&c.*) *without* our suffering, which now he attaineth by it, if *sin* were not the *meritorious Cause?* and *some wrath* still in it? specially, when God hath fully told us, that *he afflicts not willingly*; that *man* suffereth but *for his sin*; *that for the iniquity of* Jacob *is all this*, &c. and that he will not afflict his Creature without its desert.

desert. If by [*Conformity to Christ*] you mean not to his *Holiness*, but to his *Suffering*: I answer, That is *no good* to us of it self, but an *evil*: For it was the *evil of Punishment* that we deserved that he bore; and therefore if it be a good to be therein conformed to him; then it is good to bear God's Vindictive wrath. Indeed we may have comfort in our suffering, in that we suffer but what Christ hath suffered (in several respects that I need not stand on:) But the good is, that our Conformity in suffering, tends to make us conform in Holiness, and so in Glory, in our measure.

Aphorism.

Page 71. THE *sufferings of the godly, proceed from a mixture of love and anger*, &c.

Animadverf.

Love and Anger are not opposite, but Love and Hatred: And you presently say, There is no hatred, though there be anger.

Reply.

They are not *fully opposite*, nor inconsistent; else I should not think Chastisement is from both. But sure there is some opposition: Let their Objects be judg. The Object of *Love*, is [*Present Good*;] the Object of *Anger*, is [*Present Evil.*] Is here no opposition? Indeed *Ira* being in the Irascible *circa malum præsens arduum*, and there being not any *bonum præsens arduum*, hath no perfect contrary.

But what you here dislike, or wherein we disagree, you give me not to understand. But how you will reconcile your Concession here, with your former speech, that [Sanctified Suffering is not

evil,] I know not. For surely if it proceed from *Anger* in any part, so far sin is the Cause (and the fruit of sin is to us evil,) and the effects of Anger, as such, will be evil, *malum pœnæ*, to us. As therefore it comes from *sin*, and God's *Anger*, it still continueth *evil to us*: But as it comes from Christ's *Blood*, and God's *Love*, it is *good Accidentally and Eventually*, and the good to us is greater than the evil.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *Death is one of the Enemies that is not yet overcome*, &c. 1 *Cor.* 15. 26.

Animadverf.

Though Death be not fully and perfectly overcome till the Resurrection, yet to the godly it it not *evil*, nor a *curse*. The sting of it, *viz.* Sin, being taken away, it cannot hurt, but only convey unto a better life: *To me to live is Christ, and to die is gain*, Phil. 1. 21. *The sting of Death is sin, and the strength*, &c. 1 *Cor.* 15. 56, 57.

Reply.

1. This is answered already.

2. I confess the sting is taken out.

3. But if it be not evil; then, 1. How is it yet [*an Enemy?*] an Enemy, and no evil! 2. Why do you confess it a *Punishment?* If the sanctifying remove *all* the *evil*, and removeth the *penalty*; *Good* is no *punishment*. 3. Then it is a sin to have *any fear of, or averseness to Death*; (which I believe not.) For *good* cannot be the object of *timor* or *fuga*. 4. If it *hurt not* (as you affirm) why do men *groan* and *fear* it, and seek to avoid it? How doth sense deceive us, if *pain hurt not?* 5. Then why doth God make promises of *longer life*, and of *recovery from sickness?* And why doth he *threaten death*, and *pain*, and *shame*, and *loss?* &c. Is *good*, as such, the

the matter of *Threatnings?* 6. Then you may dare to forbear lamenting under God's afflicting-ing hand, or taking notice of it as an evil, and ſign of his diſpleaſure! 7. And then you may dare to ſay, that you are not beholden to God for delivering you from any evil of ſuffering! For if it had come (as ſickneſs, death, *&c.*) it would have been no evil. 8. Yea, it would rather be an evil to you, to ſave you from them, if they be merely good. 9. Then you need (yea may) *not pray* againſt *evil* of ſuffering; for none may pray againſt *good* as *good.* 10. Then the godly are uncapable of *Chaſtiſements*, becauſe they are uncapable of *evil.* But I ſuppoſe you will take heed of theſe Conſequents. But enough of this.

It is *gain* to *die* accidentally: Not becauſe death is *not evil*, but becauſe it leads to a greater good: That which is called Deaths ſting, is not all the evil of it.

Aphoriſm.

THe whole ſtream of Scripture, maketh Chriſt to manage that which lieth on us for our advantage and good.

Animadverſ.

If it be ſo managed, though in it ſelf ſimply conſidered it be evil, yet to us as ſo managed, it is good.

Reply.

It is evil to ſome-body, or not evil. It is not evil to it ſelf, though in it ſelf to us. It is *per ſe malum pœnæ to us*; it is *per accidens good.* I doubt not but you will ſubſcribe to this Explication, and that we in judgment agree.

Aphorism.

Page 79. I *Know that it is the judgment of learned and godly men, that the Law as a Covenant of Works, is quite* null *and repealed, in regard of the sins of Believers.*

Animadvers.

They mean (I suppose) so as that Believers are not to be tried by the Law, to stand or fall by it. See *Rom.* 6.14. *Gal.* 3.13. & 5.18.23. Your self says, page 81. [*The alteration is not made in the Law, but in our estate and relation to the Law.*] This is enough. Our estate and relation to the Law is not now such, as that we should either be justified or condemned by it. The Law, as a Covenant, saith, *Do this and live*, Rom. 10.5. and, *Cursed is every one that continueth not*, &c. *Gal.* 3.10. Believers are not to live or die upon such terms; and therefore they are not under the Law as a Covenant of Works.

Reply.

This is a point of great difficulty and moment. I agree with your sence (if I understand you) wherein I have hitherto been happy almost all along. But what made you think that I oppose men that were of my own mind? Indeed they are two sorts that I here oppose: 1. Those that use constantly to say, *The Law is abrogated, as to the condemning power of it, to Believers: But not to others, nor to them, as to the commanding power.* These (if Truth may take place of Modesty) are the common sort of those Divines that I have met with, that never studied the nature of Laws, and understand not what Abrogation is, nor how they contradict themselves in saying, It is abrogated to Believers, *&c.* When *Abrogation* is the proper *annulling* of a Law; and when it is *null* or *abrogate*, it can oblige *none*. 2. Those that better understand themselves in Politicks, and say,

ſay, that the *Covenant of Works is abrogated properly, that is, nulled*, ſo *that no man in the World is under it.* This is a very hard, yet weighty Controverſie, I ſhall ſay little of it with you; 1. Becauſe you agree with me. 2. I have newly writ largely of it with a very Learned Neighbour-Brother, Mr. *G. Lawſon* (a man as accurately verſt in Politicks as any Miniſter I know) this being the main ſubject of a larger Conteſt between him and me; wherein I confeſs he puts me harder to it than any man that I have dealt with, and I have received much light from his Animadverſions.

Aphoriſm.

Page 82. *AND abſolute Diſcharge is granted to none in this Life: For even when we do perform the Condition, yet ſtill the Diſcharge remains conditional, till we have quite finiſhed our performance.*

Animadverſ.

There is ſuch an abſolute Diſcharge granted to ſome in this life, that there is no Condemnation belonging to them, *Rom.* 8. 1. *They have peace with God through our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, Rom.* 5. 1. *they have everlaſting life*, viz. begun in them.

Reply.

Yet we agree. I am wholly of your mind. But, 1. Our Diſcharge *before believing*, is conditional, as to *beginning* and *end*; and therefore not *actual*: (For *quod eſt in conditione, non eſt in obligatione: Et conditionale nihil ponit in eſſe.*) 2. Our Diſcharge *upon our believing* is *abſolute* and *actual quoad primam poſſeſſionem:* But it is ſtill *conditional quoad continuationem & conſummationem*, till we have finiſhed our courſe, overcome, and endured to the end. Yet it may be ſure in *God's Decree* of upholding,

ing us, that we may persevere, though it be conditional in the Law, or Testamental-Grant. For it is false which some assert, that, If the Condition be *certain*, it is *no Condition*, but *absolute*. For if it be *contingent* it sufficeth, though *foreknown* by the Donor.

Aphorism.

Page 83. IF *this were not so, but Christ hath abrogated the first Covenant*, &c.

Animadvers.

Your Reasons prove, that the first Covenant is still in force, but not that Believers are still under that Covenant, so as that either their Justification or Condemnation depend on it.

Reply.

1. I now say, the first Covenant is ceased. 2. Then they prove all that I desire. But why their Justification and Condemnation depends not on it, when yet the Law is in force, is worth the explicating.

Aphorism.

Ibid. WHat *the Law in force doth not threaten, that is not explicitely deserved, or due by Law.*

Animadvers.

The Law doth *threaten*, but it cannot *execute* upon *Believers* what it threatneth: Christ hath redeemed us from the Curse of the Law, *Gal.* 3. 13. *The strength of sin is the Law, but thanks be to God who hath given us the Victory through our Lord Jesus Christ*, 1 Cor. 15. 56, 57.

Reply.

Still we agree as to the Law *de futuro*: But I confess Mr. *L*'s Arguments are yet very knotty.

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *IT would follow that Christ died not to prevent or remove the Wrath and Curse, so deserved and due to us, for any but* Adam's *sin; nor to pardon our sins at all, but only to prevent our desert of Wrath and curse; and consequently to prevent our need of pardon.*

Animadverf.

The Law is yet in force to shew us sin, and the desert of it; but not to condemn us for it, if we be in Christ, who hath satisfied the Law for us, and freed us from the Curse of it.

Reply.

I accept your Concession. But, 1. The Law concurs to the *Constitution* of *Guilt*, as well as to the *Manifestation*. 2. I suppose you speak *de condemnatione efficaci condemnationi judicis inseparabiliter connexâ*; and so it is true, else not: For the Law doth *condemn* us, *quantum in se*, before Christ do pardon us *per legem Remediantem*. 3. We are freed by Christ's Satisfaction, only when the fruits of it are conferred on us; that is on our believing, but not on the mere payment. So your sense.

Aphorism.

Page 85. *THE New-Covenant threatneth not death to any sin, but final Unbelief; or at least to no sin without final Unbelief.*

Animadverf.

I grant that the New-Covenant, promising Life on condition of Believing, may be said to threaten death only in case of final Unbelief; that is, except one continue in Unbelief unto the end, he shall not perish: 1. Yet when it is said, that *Christ will come in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ,*

2 Thess.

2 Thess. 1. 7, 8. I conceive, that by *obeying the Gospel*, is meant obeying the *Moral Law*, to which even the Gospel it self doth require obedience, *Matth.* 5. 17, 18, 19. & 1 *Cor.* 9. 21. & *Tit.* 2. 11, 12. So that such as transgress the *Moral Law*, are liable to death, not only *by the Law*, but also by *the Gospel*, though the Gospel withal hold out pardon to those that believe, which the Law doth not. 2. Besides, few (I think) will deny, that the Old-Covenant is still of use to let us see what is due unto us for sin, and what need we have of Christ. But when it is said, that Believers are freed from the Law as a Covenant of Works; the meaning is, that they are not tied to those strict terms which are contained in that Covenant, namely, to obtain life upon condition of full and perfect obedience to the Law, or otherwise for any the least Transgression to incur eternal Damnation.

Reply.

This is the great Point that so many oppose; wherein yet you agree with me. 1. It is not only an *implicite* Threatning (implied in the Promise) to Unbelievers; but an *explicite*. 2. I believe not, that by the *Gospel of Christ*, 2 *Thess.* 1. 7, 8. is meant *directly* the *Moral Law*, *as such*: But obedience to the *Moral Law*, is *implied* in it, so far as it is the *Law of Christ*, to be *sincerely* obeyed, as a consequent of Faith, and implied in Faith. 3. I yet discern not that any is liable, or virtually-adjudged to death by the *New-Law* (as distinct from that of Works) for *Unbelief* or *Disobedience*, but on supposition that they be *final*. Indeed, whether it be *final* or *not*, men are at present children of Wrath that remain impenitent: But that is; because they are so by the *Law of Works*, and the Law of Grace hath *not yet delivered* them; but it saith not, that *they shall not be delivered*, but on supposal of perseverance to the end in that Impenitency. 4. The Old-Covenant is not only of use

use to let us *see our Due:* but first to *constitute that Due*, and then to *manifest it.*

Aphorism.

Page 86. *Scripture plainly teacheth, That all men, even the Elect, are under the Law, till they believe.*

Animadverf.

True: But not *after* they believe, as you seem to hold, *p.* 78, & 79. you plainly declare your self to dissent from those learned and godly men, who exempt Believers from the Law, as a Covenant of Works. Yet you yield as much as they (I presume) desire. *V.* 87. you cite the words of the Apostle, *They that are led by the Spirit, are not under the Law, and against such there is no Law*, Gal. 5. 18, 23. *Page* 88. you say, [The Obligation to Punishment is dead as to us. *Rom.* 7. 6. but not the Law void or dead in it self. I know not why any should desire more than is here granted: Neither do I believe, that those learned and godly men whom yet you profess your self to dissent from, did intend more.

Reply.

1. The intent of the first sort of them cannot be known by their words; for they are self-contradictory. The intent of the second sort is for much more; as you would be quickly brought to believe, if you did but read some Volumes of Papers written to me on this subject.

2. I am glad that I so far agree with you, that you can so hardly believe that any others differ from me (that are godly and learned.)

3. For my seeming to make Believers under the Law. I answer, So do you. They are *so far* under the Law, that it maketh *them guilty*, that is, obligeth them to punishment; which is *Condemnatio Legis:* But this *guilt*, as it accrues, is *remitted*; and this *Obligation* dissolved, when contracted; and this

this *Condemnatio Legis*, shall never procure the *Condemnationem Judicis*, because there is in force, and still at hand *superaddita Lex Gratiæ Remedians*, dissolving the foresaid Obligation.

This is in brief my judgment of that great point. I dare not yield to them that say, *The Law is abrogated (de Futuro;)* nor to ordinary Divines, to say, *It is abrogated to Believers*, lest I should utterly deny a possibility of any pardon, by denying all reality of guilt: For where there is no *actual guilt* (though there may be Potential and Conditional, as some speak) there is no place for pardon. Where there is no Obligation, there can be no dissolving of that which is not.

Aphorism.

Page 89. *WHosoever will repent, and believe in him to the end, shall be justified*, &c.

Animadverf.

No doubt, as in other Graces, so in Faith, perseverance is required. *Now the just shall live by faith: But if any man draw back, my Soul shall have no pleasure in him*, Heb. 10.38. Yet Justification is promised simply to them that believe: *By him all that believe are justified*, Acts 13.39. It is not suspended till a man be a Believer to the end. You will say, The continuance of Justification doth depend on the continuance of believing. I grant it: But true justifying Faith is never lost, nor true Justification ever reversed. *Whom he justifieth, them he also glorifieth*, Rom. 8.30.

Reply.

Still we agree. 1. As if you marry a Beggar, your Riches and Honor is hers *inceptively*, or *quoad primam possessionem (& primum Jus)* on her *consent* or *Marriage*-Covenant: But the *continuance* is on condition of *continuing that consent* and *fidelity*. Our *first*, or *begun-actual Justification* in *Law* is on our *first*

first believing; but both the *continuance* and *consummation*, and the great Justification by *Sentence at Judgment*, and the benefit of *Glory* to be adjudged us thereupon, are all on condition of our perseverance and overcoming. 2. That justifying Faith is never lost, nor Justification hath any intercision, doth not contradict, but very well suit with the necessity of the said perseverance in Faith, as the condition of continued and consummate Justification. The Decree of God causeth that perseverance: But yet the Law (being the Rule for man to live by, and God to judg by, and not the opener of all his counsels) doth not (as a Law) alway take notice of that. As God's Decree is, that all the Elect shall believe, and yet his *Law* doth most fitly require Faith of them, as the condition of their Justification and Glory.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *And be moreover advanced to far greater Priviledges and Glory than they fell from.*

Animadvers.

This seemeth to imply, that only an outward and earthly happiness was promised in the first Covenant, to which I have spoken before.

Reply.

It neither implieth, nor seemeth to imply any such thing, if by [*outward and earthly*,] you mean *objective & materialiter*, consisting of outward and terrene blessings only. But whether *Adam*'s high enjoyment of God, should have been on Earth, or in Heaven, I cannot tell. I will not pretend to be wiser than I am.

Aphorism.

Aphorism.

Ibid. AND *for their neglect of that, shall suffer far greater Condemnation.*

Animadvers.

Not in kind, but only in degree, as I have also shewed before.

Reply.

1. That's all that I urge and desire you to yield to. The scratch of a pin, and the pulling off a mans flesh with pincers, are pains that differ not in kind, but degree: Yet in a Civil or Law sence, they differ *in kind:* For so a *natural gradual difference*, may constitute a *Civil or Moral specifick* difference.

2. Yet, if *pœna damni* be any *pœna*, your Assertion is not beyond dispute. For to be an adopted son in Christ, and a member of the Son of God, and one with him who is one with the Father, are priviledges which I cannot prove that *Adam* should have enjoyed, if he had not sinned, nor any of their kind.

Aphorism.

Page 91. JEr. 31. 31, *&c.* Heb. 8. 8, *&c. containeth not the full tenor of the whole New-Covevenant: But either it is called the New-Covenant, because it expresseth the nature of the benefits of the New-Covenant, as they are offered on God's part, without mentioning mans conditions*, &c.

Animadvers.

What conditions on mans part can be assigned, which are not implied, *Jer.* 31. 33. & *Heb.* 8. 10. *I will put my Law in their inward parts, and will write it in their hearts?* Where also it is expressed that God will work these conditions which he doth require; as presently here you acknowledg, saying, *Or else*

else it speaketh only of what God will do for his Elect in giving them the first Grace, and enabling them to perform the conditions of the New-Covenant.

Reply.

* *Memorandum*, That I have over, and over, and over professed my self of your judgment, as you confess, and I have fullier elsewhere expressed. Only taking it for more difficult than sometime I have done, I hold it not as so clear and certain a truth, but that in modesty I may take in the other opinion. If I must therefore argue against my self and you: I answer you, 1. If it should be but the Confirmation, Radication, or further degree of Grace that is here meant, then your Answer may be at hand. 2. What condition on mans part is there, that is not comprehended in circumcising the heart to love the Lord, and the heart of their seed? and yet it is promised *conditionally*, Deut. 31.3. What condition on mans part is there, that is not comprized in the gift of the *Holy Ghost?* Yet God giveth his *Holy Spirit* to them that ask it. And how oft is the Holy Ghost said to be given to them that *believe?* And Christ promiseth, *Prov.* 1. *Turn ye at my reproof, and* [*I will pour out my Spirit unto you.*] But this is against my self and you.

* Since the writing of this, the Context satisfieth me; that these Texts speak not of the first Grace.

Aphorism.

Page 95. HE *never maketh a relative change, where he doth not make a real also.*

Animadvers.

1. Yet in your Animadversions on Mr. *Bedford* about Baptism, you seem to hold a Relative change in Infants, without

any real change in them; *viz.* That they are justified and freed from the guilt of sin, and yet are not *sanctified*, as we usually take the word, by the infusion of Grace into the Soul. I cannot see but that generally, as well in Infants as others, Justification and Sanctification, in that sence, go together, 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. *Rom.* 8. 9.

2. But to take your words in the full latitude and extent of them, they seem not true: For in the members of the visible Church, generally there is a relative change; they have special relation to God; and yet in many of them there is no real change; *i.e.* they are no more inwardly holy than mere Aliens.

Reply.

I confess you have now met with me: I ought to have spoken so cautelously, that my speech might not have been so obnoxious to a misinterpretation. But yet thus far I may justly Apologize: 1. I did not mean it of Infants or Ideots, but only of the Aged and Rational. 2. I plainly speak of a real change only, as necessary to give title to the relative. And I do not see yet, but this is true of all, for all your two Exceptions. And first for Infants, I answered, 1. They have not the relations of [*justified, adopted Church-member*, &c.] but upon a *real change* or work, to give them title: But that work is on the *Parents* (and not requisite in themselves) which gives title both to Parent and Child to the relative benefits. I said not, that [*God never makes a relative change, where he makes not a real on the same person.* 2. And for my judgment against Mr. *Bedford*: 1. I do shew my doubtfulness in that point: I have proved the *relative* change on Infants; when you have proved the *real* on them to be as *common*, then I will yield to you, and thank you. But you must be pleased to consider withal, how to resolve the difficulties on the other side; and answer both the

Arguments

Arguments of the Fathers, and Mr. *Bedford*, and *Davenant*, and *Ward*, &c. which are brought to prove the efficacy of Baptism to its just end *non-ponenti obicem*, if you deny the ordinary relative change on Infants: or if you yield it, but withal maintain the certain concurrence of an infusion of Grace (as you speak) even into them that after perish; then be pleased to prove, that such true Sanctification (for so you call it) may be lost (which seems to be against your judgment) and answer the rest of my Arguments against Mr. *Bedford*. It is easie enough to see inconveniences seeming to clog an Opinion: But we must withal consider the inconveniencies of the contrary Opinion. If you maintain, that the Child of a true Believer, presented to God by Baptism, according to his Ordinance, in Prayer and Faith by the Parents, doth not receive Remission of sin (certainly;) I think you must either say, that *Remission is not an end of the Ordinance*, and so it is not a Seal of Remission, or of the Remitting-Covenant of Grace (which is not true;) or else, that *God's Ordinances may miss of their ends, without mans causing-fault*; and that God's Covenant to his People and their Seed, may be broken; or else (encline to the Anabaptists, and say) that *All the Seed of true Believers are not in the Covenant of Grace* with God, nor should be baptized; and *we know not which of them it is that are in Covenant*: Or else devise another Covenant of Grace, containing only *Church priviledges*, and not *Remission* (which some call an *external Covenant*) as to the benefit promised; and say, that the Seed of Believers are only in this, and Baptism sealeth only to this: Which leaveth the Children of Be-

lievers in as hopeleſs a caſe as the Anabaptiſts leave them: which contradicteth Scripture, which appointeth Baptiſm for higher ends, *viz.* for Remiſſion of ſins; and which hath given the Anabaptiſts that advantage to inſult, by playing upon that new-deviſed Covenant; and even baffle us, when we cannot prove it from Scripture, and ſo doth much harden them, and encreaſe their number (as I know by experience of them.)

For the Text you cite, that 1 *Cor.* 6.11. ſpeaks expreſly of the Aged; and I think ſo doth that *Rom.* 8.9. The Word ſaith alſo, *He that believeth not, ſhall be damned*, and yet that is not extended to *Infants*. Beſides, thoſe Infants that have only *Remiſſion*, and not the *Spirit*, will loſe it (this may be ſaid;) and therefore are not Chriſt's in that ſtrict ſence, as thoſe that have *both*. If you ſay, What if they die in Infancy? Thoſe of that judgment will anſwer you, That then (if the Parents were true Believers) it is a certain ſign that they had the *Spirit* as well as Remiſſion. So much of Infants.

2. And for your ſecond Exception, I reply, 1. My ſpeech fully ſhews, that I meant not *all Relations*, but only *ſaving-Relations*; as, *Remiſſion*, *Juſtification*, *Adoption*, &c. But yet I ſee no appearance of ſtrength againſt it in your Argument, if I *had* meant ſo. For is there *no real change* in the members of the *viſible* Church? Of *Infants* I have ſpoke before: And if there be none in the reſt, then the Church differs little from the Pagan World, if they differ *only in Relation*; and then any man may be be baptized, whether he *profeſs Repentance and Faith* or not? Is the *ſolemn Profeſſion of believing in Chriſt*, and *repenting of all ſin*, and *covenanting* to forſak

forsake the World, Flesh and Devil, and to fight under Christ's Banner faithfully to the death, is this no Real change?

But I know you will say, It is not true Sanctification.

I reply, 1. Our Question is only of a *real change*, and not of *true Sanctification*. 2. As their *real change* is not true Sanctification, but *Profession*, or a *common* change; so their *relative change* is not *true Justification*, but to be annumerated to visible Professors, and partake of common Priviledges. Not because the Covenant of God doth contain no more, or that they enter any other Covenant; but because they perform not the conditions requisite to the participation of more, in that they do not sincerely accept the terms of the Covenant, and accordingly re-engage themselves to Christ.

Aphorism.

Page 103. HE *must have a twofold Righteousness, answerable to the two Covenants, that expecteth to be justified.* (vid. locum.)

Animadvers.

You speak of a twofold Righteousness, requisite and necessary unto Justification; but (so far as I can judg) this Doctrine is not founded upon Scripture. For that shews us, that Christ's Satisfaction merely is the Righteousness whereby we are justified, though Faith be required on our part, that it may be imputed to us as ours, that so we may be justified by it. Faith is the condition whereby we are made partakers of that Righteousness, *viz.* Christ's Satisfaction; and in that respect we are said to be justified by Faith, *Rom.* 5.1. with *Acts* 13.39. But that Faith is a distinct Righteousness, by which, together with Christ's Satisfaction, we must be justified, seems to be as if we should make the Medicine and the applying of it two things co-ordinate each with other, when as the one is but subordinate and subservient, as it were, to the other, to work the cure; the

Medicine being to no purpose, except it be applied. It cannot, I think, properly be said, that we are cured partly by the Medicine, and partly by the Application, but by the Medicine as applied: So neither is it proper to say, that we are justified partly by Christ's Satisfaction, and partly by Faith, each of them being a distinct Righteousness whereby we are justified, but that we are justified by Christ's Satisfaction as our only Righteousness in that respect; yet not by it simply considered; but as that whereby it is made ours, that we may be justified by it.

Reply.

You come now a little nearer the quick; and therein seem very strongly to dissent from me: But when all is examined, it proves most but in words, while you grant in sense all, or most that I desire. Yet because this is a point of so great moment, and you think here lieth my πρῶτον ψεῦδος, I think necessary to handle it more fully. And because you pass over (without taking notice of it) the Explication of my sence of Righteousness, I must briefly repeat it.

It is not the *particular Vertue* called *Justice*, by which we give *suum cuiq;* distributively or commutatively, which we now are handling. It is *in sensu forensi* that we speak of *Righteousness* and *Justification.* And in that sense, Righteousness is either *causæ vel personæ.* The *persons Righteousness* is joyned in the Righteousness of his *Cause*, and ever supporteth it. The *Cause* is sometime only *one Action* or *Habit*, or some *few* only; and then the *person* is justified but *secundum quid*, or as to *that Action* of which he was accused, and no further (by the Righteousness of that his *Cause.*) Sometime the Cause is *all a mans Actions* or *Dispositions* which are called in question, which he is put to justifie;

fie: And if he justifie *all*, he *fully* justifieth *his person*, which is called *Justificatio personæ* in the most usual sense of that phrase. But yet a mans *Cause* may lye in other things than *Actions* or *Dispositions*: (of which anon) and he may have other ways to be justified.

The *Righteousness* in question is contrary to *guilt*. *Guilt* is twofold, 1. *Reatus culpæ*. 2. *Reatus pœnæ*: The first so called, in reference to the *Precept* or *Prohibition*: The second, in reference directly to the *Sanction*.

So is there a *twofold Righteousness*, and in either of them is considerable, both the *form*, and the *quasi-materia*. The *Precept* commandeth to do, or not do. He that *obeyeth accordingly*, is *righteous*, and not *reus culpæ*. The *Sanction* containeth *Promises* and *Comminations*, or determineth *de præmiis & pœnis*: He that is not *obligatus ad pœnam*, is righteous in respect to the *Commination*; and he that hath *jus ad præmium*, is *righteous* as to the *premiant act* of the Law.

As *Justification* supposeth *Accusation*; so *Righteousness* supposeth (in the *Judicial* sense of the word) a *possibility* of *Accusation*.

As the Law consisteth of these two parts (the *preceptive* (*de agendo vel non agendo*) and the *Sanction*;) so there is a *twofold Accusation* that we are liable to: 1. That *we have sinned*, or have *Reatum culpæ*. 2. And that we are therefore *Obligati ad pœnam*, and have no title to the Reward. To be righteous, in respect of the *former Accusation* (if it be according to the Law of Works at least, that we are accused, or (as I think) the Law of Grace either) is to be *Non-peccator*, or to be *Innocent*. To

be righteous, in respect to the *latter Accusation*, is to be *Non-obligatus ad pœnam*, or *non-condemnandus*; or *to be rewarded*, if the Accuser deny his title to the Reward: Or, if this last be questionable, whether [*Just*] signifie [*Rewardable?*] yet none can question the former, Whether it signifie [*non obligatus ad pœnam.*]

The *formal* nature of [*Righteousness*] therefore is *relative*: Even such a transcendental relation is it, as is *Reatus*, to which it is opposed; and as *Debitum* is, which is the common formal nature of all proper *Morality*. And for the *fundamentum* and *subject* of this relation: The *first subject* of *Righteousness* which is opposed to *Reatus culpæ*, is *Actio vel Actionis suspensio* (under which is comprized the *Dispositions*:) And *from* the *Action*, it resulteth to the *Agent* or *Person*, who is the *last subject* of it; The *Person* is therefore righteous (in this first sense) because his *actions* and *dispositions* are righteous.

The *subject* of the *latter sort* of Righteousness (which is opposite to *Reatus pœnæ*) is *only* the *person*.

The *immediate fundamentum* of the *former* Righteousness, as it is *personæ*, is the *justitia actionum & dispositionum*, as being *his own*: And so it is a *relation* founded in a *relation*, and *both Moral*.

The *immediate fundamentum* of the Righteousness of his *actions*, is yet *another relation*; viz. Their *Conformity* to the *Precept* or *Rule* (considering this Conformity *in esse Reali*, as it is presupposed to the *esse Morale*.) For it is presupposed, that my *action* be the same that is commanded, considering both the *Command* and *Action* merely *in genere entis*, before we consider that *action* as *debitum*

tum in generis moris: And the *fundamentum* of this relation of *Conformity*, is immediately the *proportio quantitativa vel perfectio adæquata actionum quoad regulam.* So that the *remote fundamentum* of this *Conformity*, is the same with the *subjectum*, that is, the *Actions themselves*, or *the Dispositions*: *Et ita remotè fundatur in actione & qualitate*: And the *nearest fundamentum* is that *degree* and *number of actions*, wherein consisteth that perfection which is the *Adæquation* to the Rule; and so it is founded *in quantitate vel graduali perfectione.* For this *Conformity* containeth, as it were, a conjunction of a twofold *relation*, that is, *similitude (remotius)* and *equality (propius.)* So much of that first Righteousness, which is a *Conformity* to the *Precept* as *Precept.*

Where observe next, that this is none of our Righteousness, as I have proved, I think, in the Aphorisms: That we have *no such Righteousness*, as in *our own Works*, is beyond doubt among all good Christians. And that we have *no such Righteousness of Christ* (in this *form*, or as such) imputed to us strictly, and in it self, I perceive you and I are agreed. (Though I will not be so peremptory as to condemn them that maintain, [*the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness of this kind, as made ours only by Faith, upon the right of Union, as being Civiliter one person with* * *Christ*;] yet I utterly renounce their Doctrine, that make this Righteousness ours, on the ground of our interest in the mere payment, before any Faith; as if Christ obeyed *in nostrâ personâ*, and so make us *one with Christ before Faith*: For I could shew

* Though I hold it a perilous Doctrine.

shew, that this overthroweth the main substance of the Gospel. I judg that God doth not for Christ's Righteousness esteem us to be *non peccatores*, but to be *non condemnandos*, and so to be *quasi non peccatores quantum ad reatum pœnæ*.

It is therefore the *second kind* of *Righteousness (non Debitum* * *pœnæ)* which is *ours*, and which we have here to enquire after. The *relative form* of this I have spoke of. The *subject* is the *person* himself. (To say, that *Christ is righteous* for us, *if we our selves* be not also *righteous*, is no more to our comfort, than that Christ shall be *glorified for us*, when we our selves shall perish.) The *fundamentum* of this *relation* is twofold: The first and immediate, which is the *efficient cause* of our Righteousness, is without the person, *viz.* the *Donation* or *Constitution* of the Law or *Covenant*. The second *subordinate*, *more remote*, and *less proper Foundation*, is in our *title* to that Donation: (I call it *Titulus* in the Law-sense) (though *duo fundamenta immediata faciunt duplicem relationem*, *tamen duo fundamenta subordinata non item.*) Or, if you, will call the *Law* or Gift only the *fundamentum* and title, and the other but the *condition*. This *Titulus* containeth in it two things considerable: 1. *Rationem formalem Tituli.* 2. *Rationem fundamentalem, vel causalem. Titulus ad beneficium ex conditione datum (præter ipsam donationem) est conditionis præstatio.*

* *Jus ad impunitatem & vitam.*

By *Titulus* here I mean but that which we must produce of our own, to prove our special right: And not the *fundamentum juris* in full sense. For that is the Deed of gift, which therefore is most properly our title.

præstatio. Hic igitur ratio fundamentalis est duplex: 1. *Causa conditionis, quâ conditio est.* 2. *Causa præstationis vel conditionis quâ præstitæ. Causa conditionis quâ conditio est itidem duplex.* 1. *Remotior & quasi materialis quæ est Aptitudo rei ad hoc officium.* This *Aptitude* is denominated in its respect to the ends of the Legislator: which ends are two, 1. That himself and Laws receive no dishonor or wrong. 2. That the subject or party obliged, have a meet way to receive the benefit. Accordingly, the condition is *naturaliter apta*, 1. Which consisteth in the Creatures performance of its duty in perfection (as in the Old-Law;) or else, which supposing the wrong of the Legislator repaired, doth give the Repairer also the honor of his Grace (as Faith doth in the New-Covenant:) The former containeth a meritorious Dignity; the latter presuppoſeth it elsewhere. 2. Which containeth a fitness to the ascertaining our benefit (this is but subordinate, or less principal.) 2. *Causa conditionis quâ talis Proxima, est Institutio Legis vel fœderis*: This is the very *immediate fundamentum*, whence the *formalis ratio conditionis* doth result. It is a *Condition*, because the Legislator or *Donor* doth constitute it such. It is the immediate result of his Constitution, or discovered will.

Where note, that this Act of the Law [*Instituere conditionem*] is quite different from that other Act which I named a little before, viz. [*Constituere debitum præmii vel pœnæ.*] Both are contained in one sentence, [*If thou obey perfectly to the end, thou shalt live;*] or, [*If thou believe, thou shalt be justified, and not come into condemnation, nor perish.*] But the former part of the sentence, [*If thou believe,*] or, [*Whosoever believeth,*] doth institute the condition:

And

And the latter part doth instiute the *debitum præmii*, and so for the *debitum pœnæ*. Also, this Institution of the *condition as a condition*, is quite different from the Instituting of the *dueneſs* of the same thing *ut officium*, as a *mere duty*: Which is done by the *Precept* as a *Precept* absolutely; and not in connexion to the *Sanction*, the performance whereof doth only institute the first sort of Righteousneſs opposite to *reatus culpæ*, which I before spoke of. So much *de fundamentali ratione conditionis quâ conditio*.

2. And then for *conditio qua præstita*, or the performance it self, which doth most immediately make it to be *Titulus ſecundarius*; it is the *Actus præſtantis*: The intereſt of the party receiving the benefit, is in all this implied (else is it not *conditio præſtita*.)

Here note these Propositions:

Prop. 1. The *form* of this Righteousneſs, is neither the *Law*, nor the *Title*, nor any *Habit* or *Act* which make up the *Title*; nor any *Merit* or *Satisfaction* prerequisite to the Title: But only the [*non debitum pœnæ*,] to be [*not guilty*;] *non obligatus ad pœnam*, [*non condemnandus*:] or, *Jus ad impunitatem (quoad pœnam damni & ſenſus; jus ad vitam æternam, per Chriſti juſtitiam promeritum & gratis (ſub conditione receptionis congruæ) donatum*.

Prop. 2. *Man's own Actions* are not the *fundamentum immediatum* of his Righteousneſs: But the Constitution or tenor of the Law or Covenant is it. This will be thought strange by some perhaps, that *Adam's perfect obedience* did not *immediately* constitute him righteous, or *non reum pœnæ*; but that we should be *made righteous* by *God's Law without us*, more *properly* and *immediately*, than the *Habits* and *Acts* of holineſs within us, and perform-

ed

ed by us. But it is clear: For *Righteousness* (now in question) is but the *debitum præmii*, or *non debitum pœnæ*: And *debitum* is the *immediate result* or product of the *Law* or *Gift*, and not of our *Actions*.

But you may object, *At least our Acts are the material cause.*

I answer, If by the *matter*, you mean the *subject*, then they are not here: For here only the *person* is the subject righteous (*non obligatus ad pœnam:*) But the matter of our Title-condition they may be.

Prop. 3. In several senses therefore the *Form*, the *Fundamentum* and the *Title* may be called, [*our Righteousness:*] But so, as one be not taken for the other; 1. When we say, the *Form* is our *Righteousness*, it is but an explicatory Proposition *de nomine*; for otherwise *nihil prædicatur de seipso:* The same thing is not the *subject* and *predicate*. 2. The *Gospel-Donation* or Constitution *de non condemnando fideli*, may be called *our Righteousness fundamentaliter*, as being the *direct efficient* thereof: As the *Law's Constitution de non condemnando perfectè obedienti*, was the *fundamentum* of *Adam's Righteousness*. 3. But most commonly we give the name to the *conditio præstita*, which is our *Title* secondary to Righteousness. Of which in particular we must speak more anon.

And thus I have given you my thoughts about the nature of Righteousness in general, and the first distribution of it from the two parts of the Law, *Precept* and *Sanction*. Now I come to the second necessary distribution of it, which is from the two *distinct Laws or Covenants*; which is the thing that you deny:

deny: And here I will, 1. Prove, that *there is a twofold Righteousness* necessary in respect of the *two Covenants*. 2. And shew you the *nature* of them, and the *difference* between them. 3. The necessity hence of a *twofold Justification*; and in particular, of *a Justification by Works*. 4. I shall tell you of some Learned Divines that fully hold forth this Doctrine as I do. And,

1. That here are *two distinct Righteousnesses* necessary, I shall prove now to you from these six several *Mediums*; which I think best, both for speed and strength, to lay all together. Where there are, 1. *Distinct Laws*, which our Righteousness must respect. 2. And *distinct Legislators* or *Judges*. 3. And *distinct Accusations*. 4. And *distinct Termini proximi*. 5. And *distinct Termini remotiores*. 6. And *distinct Titles*: there must needs be distinct Righteousnesses: But so it is in the present case; therefore, *&c.*

Yet one of these alone will be a sufficient proof. And, 1. If there be *distinct Laws* from whose condemnation we must be freed, and which require distinct *conditions* of that freedom, then there are *distinct Righteousnesses*: But, *&c.* therefore, *&c.*

Yet here is a great difference (of which more anon.) The *Law of Works* doth not *justifie* us, nor cease to condemn us, because Christ satisfied not *the Law properly*, but the *Lawgiver*: For the Law knows no satisfaction strictly so called; but requireth *solutionem vel officii præcepti, vel pœnæ comminatæ (si ita dicam.)* It was neither of these that Christ performed: For *Actio Noxialis sequitur caput*. But yet Christ *satisfied God as the Legislator of that Law*, and so satisfied the *ends* of the *Law*;

so

so that though for all this Satisfaction, the *Law* condemns us still (as knowing no such thing as Satisfaction; it being a *supra*-legal act to admit of Satisfaction which is *redditio æquivalentis, loco ipsius debiti*;) yet *Deus ut judex secundum hanc legem*, condemneth us not: The *condemnatio legis*, is but *condemnatio virtualis & impropria*: *Condemnatio enim strictissime sumpta, est sententia.* It is therefore *condemnatio judicis* that is the full proper condemnation; and this we are freed from. Not *ne sit*, that it be not at all; for God sentenced man presently on the fall in part: But, 1. *ne sit plena & rigorosa*; God did not *fully* then sentence according to the sence of the Law. 2. *Ne sit executio vel plena, vel continuata*: So that though it be *ex post-facto*, when the Sentence is past, that Satisfaction is given, yet it is the ground of our Deliverance, and so that we are not *plenè & ad pœnam perpetuam condemnandi per judicem propter violationem istius legis.* The execution would have been full and continued, and that in rigor, if Satisfaction had not been made. Besides, though God had past Sentence on man for his sin at first, yet not on particular persons for all the sins of their lives, which are after committed against that *Law*: So that the *Legislator* will call *Satisfaction* [*Righteousness*,] as attaining his Legal ends, though that *Law* it self will not: And the Law it self did necessitate it.

2. And here is a *distinct Legislator and Judg. Deus Creator* makes the *first Law*, requiring perfect obedience; and for want of it, beginneth Sentence and Execution, and admitteth of Satisfaction for the stay of it, and for our full deliverance from the incurred misery. Upon which *Satisfaction received*, he

he giveth up all to the *Redeemer*, and *himself judgeth no man, but giveth all judgment to the Son:* And at the *Sons Judgment*, it will be part of our *deliverance* to be freed from the *Judgment* or *Condemnation of God as Creator*. I mean, as *Judex secundum solam legem primam:* So that though he judg not, yet that is our *freedom*; for *non judicari hoc modo*, is *non condemnari*.

John 5. 22.

3. But most plain and undeniable it is, that we are liable in Judgment to *distinct Accusations*; not only *circumstantially distinct* (for I will not distribute *à Circumstantiis*) but even as to *distinct Laws violated*, or *distinct kind of sins*, and *distinct Comminations* against us, and *distinct penalties* incurred, and distinct *conditions* unperformed (of which after.)

1. We are liable to be accused as *sinners* in general, and so as having *broken the first Law*, and thereby deserved the *penalty*. This is a *true Accusation*, and against it *directly* there is *no Justification*. But against the *annexed Accusation*, that [therefore we are *per judicem condemnandi ut obligati ad pœnam*] we must be justified, as by pleading the *Dissolution of the Obligation per legem remediantem*, as the *efficient cause*; so by pleading *Christ's Satisfaction* as the *meritorious cause*, and *quasi materia* of our Righteousness; and as being a valuable consideration for the dissolving of our obligation to punishment.

But then we are liable to a *second Accusation*; viz. *That we have no right in Christ, and the benefits of his Satisfaction:* That *we are not Believers*, and that therefore *we are guilty of that far sorer punishment*. Is not this Accusation *toto Cœlo* different from the former? If *this Accusation* be true, the sinner must be condemned for want of *title to Christ*; and

and that on two grounds, 1. Because he is left undelivered from the condemnation of the *first Law*. 2. Because he is found guilty by the tenor of the *New-Law*, both of the said *non-liberation*, and of the *additional punishment*. But if this Accusation be false, we are justified, as we next shew, by pleading *Not guilty*.

Furthermore, this *Accusation* may be threefold;

1. That we are *non-Credentes*, *not Believers* at all, but Pagans.

2. Or that we are not *sincerè Credentes*, but *Hypocrites*, and not *true Believers*.

3. Or that we were *solifidians*, and added not *sincere obedience* to our *Faith*, and that to the end. Surely against these several Accusations, we must have several ways of Justification.

4. There are also several *Termini* or *Sentences*, from which by Justification they are to be freed; that is, both from being sentenced by *God-Creator, as Legislator of the first Law*; and from being sentenced by Christ the *Redeemer, as Legislator of the New-Law*.

5. The *Termini remotiores* also are distinct: One Condemnation which we must be justified against is, that *Death* threatned *Gen.* 3. The other Condemnation that by Justification must be prevented is, a far forer punishment.

6. And lastly, there are several *Titles* or *Pleas* against these sentences. Do you think, if Satan accuse you to be a final *Unbeliever*, or an *Hypocrite*, that it will justifie you to plead, [*Christ hath satisfied?*] Or if he say, [*Thou art a sinner,*] is it enough to say, [*I do believe?*] No: But when he pleadeth, [*Thou hast sinned, and therefore shouldest be condemned according to the Law:*] We must plead, [*quo-*

ad Meritum; *Christ hath made Satisfaction, and the merit of that sufficeth, against the demerit of my sin*; and, *quoad legis constitutionem*, the Obligation of the first Law is dissolved by the *Grant* of the latter. [So that Christ's *Satisfaction* as to the point of *Merit*, (which is the *Aptitudo ad officium conditionis* in the first Law) is *loco conditionis à nobis præstitæ*: And so far is *our Title*. But then because it being not of our *own performance*, there must concur *our actual interest*, to make it to be *formaliter Titulus* to us; and this interest is by God conveyed by a *New-Covenant* or *Law*, and this New-Law or Grant, is again *conditional*. Hence it followeth, that we are devolved over to the New-Law, before our Justification and Deliverance from the Old is absolute and compleat: And so, though Christ's Satisfaction be compleat, and *perfecta satisfactio*, and nothing be wanting *quoad meritum*; yet it is but *Titulus aptitudinalis*, *vel conditionalis*; wanting nothing in it self, but something to *appropriate* it *to us* to apply it, and give us interest: And that is, 1. On God's part, his Grant or Promise. 2. On our part, the performance of the Condition of this New-Law or Promise. So that as to our Deliverance or Justification from the Condemnation of the first *Law*, we have a threefold Title necessary to plead; or a Title thus divided: 1. *Quoad Meritum*, *Christ's Satisfaction* is our *only Title*. 2. *Quoad Appropriationem vel Applicationem:* 1. God's gift, in Christ's Testament. 2. Our performing the Conditions (though the last be most imperfectly called Title.) As if *Adam* had perfectly obeyed, there

If any had rather call Faith *Conditio Tituli*, than *ipse Titulus*, I do not dislike it, but think it the propereſt ſpeech.

there would have been in his Obedience: 1. The *meritorious Value.* 2. The *personal Interest.* So now *Christ's Satisfaction* is imputed to us for Righteousnes, as to the *Merit and Value.* But the *New-Covenant* giveth the *personal Interest:* And because it gives it but *conditionally*, therefore *our performance* is of necessity to our *personal Interest* as the Condition.

But then here being a *New-Law* (*Lex remedians*) made for this *Conveyance*, here is occasion of a *New-Accusation*, *New-Plea*, and so a *New-Righteousnes* and *Justification:* So that here is *nova causa*, and therefore must needs be *nova justitia & justificatio.* The Question was in the *first cause*, [*Whether the Prisoner or accused be* condemnandus *as a sinner, for breaking the Law of Works?*] *Quoad meritum*, it is presently determined for all: *Christ's Satisfaction* was *sufficiens pretium.* But the case cannot be fully decided by that, for then the *personal Interest* is questioned: Whereupon the cause is devolved to the *New-Law*, and the performance of its Condition. And there comes in the *second cause:* [*Whether the Defendant have performed the Condition of the New-Law or Covenant?*] And here the Condition hath not *ad aptitudinem, rationem Meriti:* Here he must be justified by producing his Faith in the Redeemer, which is the Condition: Which is the *quasi-materia* of that his Righteousnes, and so his neareſt Title to Justification. For if he be accused of *final Unbelief* or *Rebellion*, he must plead [*Not guilty.*] And here *his Acts* must *first* be justified, before *he* can be justified: Not that they must be justified *against every Charge* that can be brought against them, or as not being *sinful*, or as being a Conformity to the

Law of Works, or yet fully to the mere preceptive part of the New-Law: But as being the true *performance* of the *Condition of the New-Law*; which is the thing to be made good, when the Accusation is, that we have not performed that Condition.

Note, That where I said before, that this sort of Justification [*to be non-obligatus ad pœnam*] belongeth immediately to the man as the only subject, and not first to his actions: Yet I deny not, but his actions may be the conditional ground of it, as evil actions are the meritorious cause of guilt; only it is improper to say, that the *action* is *guilty*, or *obligatus ad pœnam*.

For indeed it is another sort of *justitia*, another relation, which we are now speaking of, distinct from [*non reus pœnæ:*] I did not mention it before as a third sort of Righteousness constituted by the Law: 1. Because it is only conditional Laws that constitute it: And, 2. Not all those neither, because sometime a Condition may not be *actio potestativa vel arbitraria*; but it may be either something casual, or some action or thing that is in anothers power. 3. And it is but *subordinate*, or a means to the last sort of Righteousness [*non reatus pœnæ:*] But yet indeed where Laws are (in their *Sanction*) conditional, they cause a threefold guilt, or a threefold Righteousness: 1. *Reatus culpæ qua talis* (by the *Precept:*) And so a *Righteousness* which is *non Reatus culpæ*. 2. *Reatus non præstitæ conditionis, quâ talis* (by the act of Law which constituteth the *Condition:*) And so a *Righteousness* which consisteth in *performing the Condition*. 3. *Reatus pœnæ propter non præstitam conditionem* (by the act of the Law instituting *Pœnam:*) And so a Righteousness contrary

trary. Now the last of these is only on the *person for the action*, and not *on the action*. But the two first, are both first on the *action*, and then on the *person*: Because *Adam*'s *actions* were *conform* to the *Precept*, and so *just*; therefore *Adam* was reputed *conform* to the *Precept*, and so *just*. Because *Paul* did perform the *Conditions* of the New-Covenant, his *action* of *Faith* and sincere Obedience was conform to that Covenant, so far as it instituted the Condition; and in that sense *just*: And if any had accused *Paul*'s actions as being *no true performance* of the *Condition* of the New-Law or Testament, *they* might first be justified from their own Justice, and then *he* consequently be in that point just by result therefrom, because the *actions* were his own, and so justified thereby against the Accusation of *non*-performance.

And this is it that we use to call the *quasi-materia* of our Righteousness; *viz.* that which is the *subjectum primum* of it, from whence it resulteth on our selves as the *subjectum ultimatum*, and there resteth. The *perfect Obedience* of *Adam* in Innocency, was the *subjectum primum justitiæ*, from whence it flowed to *Adam*'s person as the ultimate principal subject. In reference to the mere Law of Works, we have *no Righteousness strictly* so called: But as to the *Legislator* of that Law, and the *sententia judicis*, we have a *Righteousness*; and the *subjectum primum* of that is, *Christ's Satisfaction* without us, which was equivalent to our Obedience or Punishment. And therefore we use to call Christ's Satisfaction, both the *meritorious cause*, and the *matter* of our Legal-Righteousness. So when the case is, *Whether we are true performers of the Gospel-condition?* there our

Performance it self must first be *just* (in that) and *justified* as the *subjectum primum* of our Righteousness: And thence we our selves must by result be just, and so be justified by that as the *quasi-materia* of that Righteousness. So that the same Faith, which in our first cause is but *Titulus ad justitiam Christi sanguine acquisitam* (or rather only *conditio Tituli*;) is afterwards in the *second* cause, our *ipsa justitia*: For when it is *ipse Titulus* that is questioned, and so made the subject of the cause, then the *firmness* or *solidity* of that *Title* is also the *ipsa justitia*. For it is the *justitia causæ*, and consequently must be *materially* the *justitia Personæ*: I say not his *Righteousness universal*, and in *all respects*; but his Righteousness *so far*, and *as to that cause*. Thus I have shewed you the necessity of a twofold Righteousness: The proofs from particular Texts of Scripture, are already in the Aphorisms, and more shall be said of it anon, if I find a call to it.

2. Now for the *nature* and difference of these Righteousnesses, though it be fully expressed in what is said already, yet I shall add these Differences more particularly, wherein the nature will be clearlier understood.

1. One Righteousness consisteth in [*our non-obligation to punishment by the Law of Works, notwithstanding our sinning against it*;] because that *Obligation* is *dissolved* upon Satisfaction made by Christ. The *other* Righteousness consisteth in, [*our non-obligation to the far greater punishment, and also to the non-liberation from former misery*, which are threatned by the New-Covenant.] This first difference is, from the different Laws or Covenants, which have different Conditions; and the fulfilling of the Condition

Condition of each Covenant or Law, is that which is by that Covenant called the *matter* of our Righteousness; as that from whence the Immunity from the Penalty doth result.

2. Herein I express the second difference, that it is from several punishments that we are freed from. And therefore it is not the same Righteousness to be *non reus hujus pœnæ*, and to be *non reus alterius pœnæ*.

If you say as some do, that the New-Law hath no proper penalty of its own.

I answer. 1. It is not so: For even already you acknowledge, that it hath a penalty *gradually* differing: And the extremest pain of the Stone is so gradually different from the least pain of that kind, that it may constitute a specifick difference in some sense.

Object. *But there are pains gradually different, due by the same Law.*

Answer. But when it is due by a *distinct Law*, on *distinct terms*, there is requisite a *distinct Plea* for Absolution. 2. *Non-liberation* is the penalty threatned by the New-Law. He that believeth not, shall not be delivered from the Curse of the first Law. Here the *same* penalty *materially*, is the penalty of two distinct Laws, and *formally* two distinct penalties, *viz.* of the first Law, as a penalty first due by it; and of the New-Law, as it is a *non-liberation* threatned by it.

Object. *This penalty we should have been liable to, had there been no New-Covenant.*

Answ. Not *formaliter*: For it would have been but a Privation of the good of the first Covenant, but not a *Privation* (but mere Negation) of the

Liberation purchased and *offered*, which is the good of the New-Covenant. For it cannot be a *Privation*, till there be some *hope* or *means* of our enjoying it: And therefore to the Devils, the loss of God is *Privatio*; but their *non-liberation* from that misery and loss is no *Privation*: For they never had means or hopes to attain such a Liberation; *e. g.* If a hundred men lye in Prison for Murther, and fifty of them be put death without remedy: These die on the Law against Murther. But if the Parliament to the other fifty make a pardoning Act of Grace, saying, [All that will thankfully accept it, and come out of Prison, shall be pardoned, and the rest shall die by double Torments:] Here now the additional Torment is for their ungrateful refusal of pardon, not for the first fault; and the first deserved death is for both: As it is *such a death*, it is the penalty of the Law against Murther; but as it is a death inflicted after the offer of pardon (which did, as it were, conditionally give a new-life) so it is the penalty of the Law of Grace, which penalty hath in it more than the former; the loss or Privation of a *New-life*, and the *non-liberation* from the formerly-adjudged death. Thus it is in our present case so plainly, that I need not apply it.

3. A third Difference is this: Our first Righteousness is without us, in the *Merit and Satisfaction* of another, Jesus Christ; and in his free gift by Covenant. But our *second Righteousness* is *within us*, and by us: For the New-Lawgiver will not admit of a *Mediator* to *believe*, *and repent*, *and obey Christ for us*; nor of *Satisfaction* for our *final Impenitency*, *Rebellion* or *Unbelief*.

4. Dif-

4. Difference: The first Righteousness is by Divines said to be the same thing with *Remission of sin*; and in substance it is so. The *second Righteousness* is so far from it, that (as to the point in question) it consisteth in *Innocency*, or *Not-guiltiness*, that is, of the *non-performance* of the *Condition* of the New-Covenant.

5. The *first* Righteousness is opposite to that guilt which sin in general procureth. The second is opposite only to that guilt which is procured by *one kind of sin* in *special*, *viz.* Rejecting finally the Lord that bought us.

6. The *first* Righteousness, as it is materially in Christ's Satisfaction, is not the *Idem* which the Law required, but the *Tantundem*. The second is the *same* which is required by the *New-Law*, as its *Condition*.

7. The *first* Righteousness, as it is materially in Christ's Satisfaction, is not so denominated by the Law it self (which required the *Idem*, and not the *Tantundem*, *aut obedientiam aut pœnam delinquentis*, *& non pœnam innocentis*; but by the *Legislator* who is above Law. The second Righteousness is a Conformity to the Law of Grace it self, as it requireth it as a Condition.

8. The first Righteousness is, that we may be justified *à condemnatione Legis*, by *dissolving* its Obligation already contracted. The second is, that we may *prevent condemnationem Legis novæ*, and may *not contract* the guilt.

9. The *first* Righteousness seemeth to justifie us against a *true Accusation*, [*That we by sin deserved death.*] The second serveth to justifie us only against a *false Accusation*, [*That we have not performed*

performed the Condition of the New-Covenant, that is, that we have finally rejected Christ.

10. The Righteousness of the first Covenant, as required by the Covenant, lyeth in so full *Perfection of duty*, that the performance is honorable to the Creature, and would have made the reward to be of *Debt:* And as it is in Christ's Satisfaction, it is accordingly yet *more* honorable to the *Satisfier*. But the *second* Righteousness (the performance of the Condition of the New-Covenant) is purposely designed to another use; to be the sinners *self-denying* acknowledgment of his sin and misery, and insufficiency to deliver himself, and so to put all the honor from himself of his recovery, and to honor the Free-Grace of the Redeemer. So that it is not *Merit* that is its *Aptitudo ad officium conditionis*, but the glorifying of him that hath merited for us.

11. The matter of the first Righteousness is inconsistent with sin in the Performer; because the *Precept* and the *Condition* are of *equal extent:* The *perfect obeying* of the Precept, is the *Condition*. But the Righteousness of the *second* Law, may, and doth consist with *sin* against the *Precept* of that same *Law*, because the *Condition* is not of so large extent as the *Duty commanded*. Christ *commandeth* us much more than he hath directly made the *Conditions* of his Covenant. Indeed *sincere Obedience* to him is part of his Condition; and so the Precept of perfect duty, is the Rule according to which sincere Obedience doth labour to square its actions: And so the *particular duties* may be said *materially* to *belong to the Condition:* But it is but *remotely*, so far as they are necessarily the matter of *sincere Obedience*. For many a duty may be omitted, and yet Obedience be sincere.

12. Chiefly

12. Chiefly observe, that the first Righteousnes is a *justitia universalis*, where it is performed by the person himself: And it is *universalis exceptâ vel salvâ conditionis necessitate*, when it is performed by *another* (*by Christ*) and so given us. But the *second Righteousnes*, consisting in our performance of the New-Covenants Condition, is but *justitia particularis vel secundum quid*, as to *this particular cause*. I say, that the first had been *justitia universalis*, if performed by our selves (*vel naturaliter vel civiliter ut per delegatum nostrum:*) For then we had been *absolutely and perfectly innocent*. But being performed by *another* (*æquivalenter in Satisfactione*) and one that was not our Delegate, but a free Undertaker, therefore it was none of ours upon the mere performance; and therefore the Performer and the Accepter did themselves choose on what terms it should be applied to us, or be made ours *quoad fructus:* And the terms resolved on were the New-Covenants Conditions, which are now required of us to our participation hereof. So that now Christ's Satisfaction is not *simpliciter* our *universal Righteousnes*; for then there were no need of any other of any sort, to any end, no not the Inherent Righteousnes, as commonly acknowledged. But it is our *universal Righteousnes*, except only as to performance of the Condition of its Application: For Christ never died for the *final non-performance* of this: And where it is performed (as it is by all that are sacred) he need no more to die for their *non-performance*, than for any nomnial, or falsly-charged sin, which is no sin, but a duty. In all conditional Grants, the Condition is excepted from the Grant. *Quod est in conditione non est in obligatione.*

Fur-

Further, where I call the second, [*a particular Righteousness,*] understand, that there is a *twofold particular Righteousness*, according to the cause. One when the cause is of small moment to the plenary Justification and Liberation of the accused: So any Reprobate, or the Devil himself, may be falsly accused, and may be righteous as to the matter that he is accused of (as *Bradshaw* truly observes.) But the other is, when the cause is of so great moment, that the Justification or Condemnation, the Life or Death of the party depends upon it, as being the very Condition of that Act of Grace, or remedying Law which all our hope is in, and by which we must be judged: This is our last.

And here I must either explain or reverse my speech in *Aphoris.* p. 203. [*Because there is no danger to us from false Accusation before the All-knowing God, therefore Scripture saith nothing of any such Justification.*] Indeed we are in no danger of this or any Accusation (those that are in Christ:) But it is evident in *Matth.* 25. and all other descriptions of the Judgment-process, that the main point that will be in question and tryal will be, *Whether we were true Believers or Performers of the Condition of the Covenant of Grace, or not?* and so, *Whether we have that personal Inherent Righteousness, which is the Condition of our interest in Christ and his benefits.* And therefore the *Accuser* hath no hope in any other Plea against any man, but that he is an *Unbeliever*, or Rejecter of recovering mercy. He is not so ignorant of Scripture, as to think to prevail for mens Condemnation, merely because they are *sinners*, when he knows they will plead, that *Christ hath satisfied.* But he will labour to

prove,

prove, that *Christ's Satisfaction* shall *not absolve* them, because they have *no right in him*, as having *not performed his Conditions* for participation. On this the sinner must stand or fall, and the final Sentence pass.

13. The last Difference also especially to be noted is, That the *first Righteousness* is *necessary* primarily, as being the Creatures *Perfection* justly required by the holy sin-hating Creator. But the second Righteousness (personal) is required *propter aliud*, in subordination to the first, as a means to its end: And so stands in no opposition to it, nor doth it argue it of any imperfection; no more than the necessity of a means doth signifie any imperfection in the end. The whole reason and nature of Merit lyeth in the first Righteousness: But because it was not of our performance, and because the Redeemer never intended to make us lawless or masterless, therefore a New-Covenant or Law was requisite both for application, donation, or conveyance of *Christ's Righteousness* to us; and also to prescribe us our *duty* which should be necessary thereto: And so comes in the necessity of the 2d Righteousness, subordinate to the first.

Thus I have shewed you the differences of these two Righteousnesses. And though some of them are indeed the same in sense with others, yet if the variety of Notions do but conduce to the clearer Explication of the real differences, I have my end. The difference of the two Laws or Covenants, is the main ground which shews the necessity of this twofold Righteousness.

3. I should next hence shew you the necessity of a twofold *Justification*. But it is so evident from what is said, that I will add but this much: If there be a twofold *Covenant*, with distinct *Conditions*, and

and a twofold *Accusation*, *viz.* for not-performing the one or the other, then there must needs be a twofold *Justification*: But *&c. ergo*, &c. To be *accused as a sinner*, that is, [one that *did not continue in all things written in the Law to do them*,] is not the same as to be *accused* to be [*an Unbeliever or Rejecter of Christ*, or one that would not have him reign over us, or one that neglected so great Salvation, and improved not the Talents of the Redeemer's Mercies, or obeyed not the Gospel, or trod under foot the blood of the Covenant, *&c.*] Must you not be justified against the former Accusation by *Christ's blood directly?* and against the latter by your *own Innocency?* Will it serve to justifie any man, when Satan accuseth him of *final Unbelief* or *Impenitency*, to plead *Christ's Satisfaction?* Methinks this case is so plain, that I must desire your pardon that I have used so many words about it.

4. Because I come newly from transcribing a multitude of Authors that deliver the same Doctrine as I do, I will now recite the words but of a few (for this is but an Argument against prejudice.) 1. Judicious *Placæus* in *Thes. Salmurienf. Vol.* 1. *de Justif. p.* 32, 34. §. 37. §. 41. '*Idipsum fortasse hac ratione commodius explicabitur. Opponitur Justificatio Accusationi. A duabus autem Accusationibus premimur in foro divino.* 1. *Objicitur nos esse peccatores*: '*hoc est* [*Reos violatæ conditionis quæ fœdere Legali lata est.*] *Deinde objicitur nos esse infideles: hoc est* [*non præstitisse conditionem fœderis gratiæ,*] *viz.* '*Fidem. Ab Accusatione priore sola fide Justificamur; qua Christi gratiam & justitiam amplectimur. A posteriore Justificamur etiam operibus quatenus iis fides ostenditur. Ad posteriorem Accusationem respiciens*

'ſpiciens Jacobus *affirmavit meritò, ex operibus juſti-*
'*ficari hominem, & non ex fide tantum*; Paulus *vero*
'*reſpiciens ad priorem, ſola fide hominem juſtificari,*
'*&c.*

§. 42. '*In die judicii quoniam fœdus gratiæ vim*
'*Legis ſeu juris obtinet (promulgatum eſt enim in toto*
'*orbe terrarum per præcones Idoneos.) Id unum pro-*
'*bandum erit, nimirum, nos habuiſſe conditionem fœ-*
'*deris gratiæ, ſcil. Fidem. Itaq; proferenda erunt*
'*in medium opera, præſertim charitatis, tanquam il-*
'*lius conditionis, hoc eſt fidei effecta atq; argumenta*
'*demonſtrativa, ut vulgò loquuntur, à poſteriori. Vid.*
'*Theſin proximam.*

2. Ludovicus de Dieu in Jac. 2.24. '*Facile hic*
'*locus conciliatur cum iis quæ* Paulus *paſſim contra vi-*
'*detur diſputare, ſi ſtatuamus quod eſt veriſſimum,*
'1. *Apoſtolum* Jacobum *non agere hic de una ſolâ Ju-*
'*ſtificatione quæ partim fide, partim operibus peraga-*
'*tur, ſed de duabus diſtinctis, quarum prior eſt ex*
'*fide, & fide tantum, altera ex operibus eſt. Quum*
'*enim duplex inſtituatur accuſatio in fideles; una à*
'*Deo, Lege & Conſcientia à quibus verè peccatores rei*
'*aguntur, altera à Diabolo & improbis, à quibus falsò*
'*hypocriſeos, mercenarii animi, impietatis ac nefari-*
'*orum rei perhibentur, duplex requiritur Juſtificatio;*
'*una quâ in ſe verè peccatores abſolvuntur gratuitò*
'*propter Chriſtum à Reatu ſuorum peccatorum, quæ*
'*Juſtificatio à ſola fide eſt ſine operibus. Altera, quâ*
'*ut verè ſanctificati & regeniti, abſolvuntur à falſis*
'*illis Diaboli & improborum criminationibus. Quæ*
'*juſtificatio petitur ex operibus.* Jacobus *urget,*
'*utramq; eſſe conjungendam adeoq; non juſtificari ho-*
'*minem ex fide tantum, ſed & ex operibus. Id eſt,*
'*non ſufficere ut juſtificetur ex fide à peccatis quæ*
'*com-*

'*commisit, sed requiri porrò ut justificetur etiam ex* '*operibus à peccatis quorum falsò Accusatur & à* '*quibus per Regenerationem immunis est.*

'*Vide hujus rei pleniorem explicationem in notis ejus-* '*dem, in* Rom. 8. 4.

3. The same is fully asserted by *Wotton de Reconcil.* p. 1. l. 2. c. 18. and p. 2. l. 2. c. 35. p. 383. n. 7. and p. 2. l. 1. c. 7. p. 144. and Part. 2. l. 1. c. 5. p. 127. §. 3, 4. and c. 6. p. 138. n. 2. (I must content my self to refer you to the places, to save the labour of transcribing.)

1. *Bradshaw* de Justific. Lat. cap. 24. §. 21, 23, 25. 26. where he tells you of a twofold Righteousness, and that, '*Per justitiam Christi nobis imputa-* '*tam non possimus dici absolutè sive omi modo justi ac si* '*propter eam eo loco nos Deus haberet, ac si omnia ex* '*Lege sua à nobis requisita præstitissemus. Tum* '*enim post admissam & acceptam Christi justitiam il-* '*lam, nullam à nobis Deus obedientiam Legi suæ ex* '*parte nostra præstandam exigere posset. Sed per ju-* '*stitiam Christi nobis imputatam eatenus nos justos* '*factos æstimat Deus, quatenus Legis divinæ trans-* '*gressores exstiterimus. Ut in tantum ex illa Christi* '*justitia justi facti dicamur, in quantum ex inobe-* '*dientia nostra injusti constituti simus. Neq; enim* '*pro eis omnibus satisfecit Christus quæ ex Lege facere* '*tenebamur (huc enim qui Legem dissolveret in mun-* '*dum venisset:) sed pro eis tantum quæ vel contra Le-* '*gem feceramus, vel cum facere deberemus non fecera-* '*mus. Et* cap. 25. '*Cui peccati particularis &c. Vide* '*ultra.*

I confess in all this, things are not spoken so orderly as I could wish them, but the point in question is fully asserted. So *Deodate* in divers places.

And

And *Testardus* most fully *de Natur. & Grat. Synops. pag.* 164. Many more might be alledged, but these may suffice to my ends.

Thus much for the Explication and Confirmation of my Assertion. Now to your words: Your Reason why this Doctrine is not founded on Scripture is, because, [‘That shews us that Christ's Satisfaction ‘merely is the Righteousness whereby we are ju‘stified, though faith be required on our part, that ‘it may be imputed to us as ours, *&c.* Faith is the ‘Condition by which we are made partakers of that ‘Righteousness, *viz.* Christ's Satisfaction: And in ‘that respect we are said to be justified by Faith, ‘*Rom.* 5. 1. with *Acts* 13. 39. But that Faith is a ‘distinct Righteousness, by which, together with ‘Christ's Satisfaction, we must be justified, seems ‘to be as if we should make the Medicine and ap‘plying of it two things co-ordinate each with ‘other, when-as one is but subordinate and subser‘vient, *&c.*

Reply. 1. You say as much as I in sense; but only deny the term [*Righteousness*] to Faith, while you yield the *thing*.

2. Your Assertion, That it's without Scripture, is but a *Petitio principii*, and your proof none at all. You shall see the contrary fully anon, and did see Scripture enough cited in the *Aphorism*.

3. *Quoad meritum & materiam justitiæ primæ fœderis*, Christ's Satisfaction is solely and wholly our Righteousness, and not our Faith.

4. If Faith be the Condition constituted by a New-Law or Covenant, by which we are to be judged to life or death, then the performance of

that Condition is the thing materially by which that same Covenant will judg us righteous, *non reos pœnæ illius Legis*: And so when the Question is, Whether we have performed that Condition or no? the actual performance is our Righteousness as to that cause. Let any unprejudiced man judg, whether this be not clear truth.

5. You confess, that more than Faith is in the Condition: Repentance, Love, *&c.* And *James* saith, *We are justified by Works*; and Christ, *by our Words*: Therefore it is not true, that [*this is not Scripture-Doctrine and Language*;] nor that it is *improper* to say, we are thus justified. And also this is no Physical Application.

6. If it were *improper* to say, *We are healed by the Medicine, and by the Application*: 1. Then common speech deceives us. 2. Rules of Logick deceive us. 3. Scripture should speak improperly in saying, We are justified by Faith and Works, and not only by Christ's Satisfaction. 7. The Application of a Medicine hath its interest in the Cure *ex necessitate & aptitudine naturali* immediately. But Faith, Repentance and sincere Obedience, have their interest in our Justification; but remotely *e naturali aptitudine*, and immediately *proximè, e Constitutione Divina*, and in their *Moral* respect. And therefore your example from a *Physical* case to an *Ethical* or *Political*, will little hold or illustrate.

8. But you do very strangely seem to overlook the frequently-inculcated passages of my Book, and so to mistake and overlook my meaning in that very point, wherein I most fully express it, when you speak of [*a distinct Righteousness, together with Christ's Satisfaction*, &c. *as two things co-ordinate*

whi

which partly one, partly the other justifie, when one is subordinate, &c.] What have I said so frequently and fully, as that *Faith* is *no part* of our *Legal Righteousness?* That it is not joyned with Christ's Satisfaction to make up our Righteousness? nor is one grain of it? nor hath any Merit in it? or is accepted for its value? *&c.* I fully profess that they are *not co-ordinate*; but that the very *New-Law* or *Covenant* is but *subordinate* to the *Old*; and consequently the *Righteousness* required by it, is but *subordinate* and *subservient* to the Righteousness of Christ's Satisfaction for our sins against the Law; and that it is the *Condition* of enjoying it: And therefore *our Righteousness so far, because a Condition instituted by a New-Law.* It is injurious therefore to talk of *Co-ordination* as my sense, who so constantly profess the one to be *subservient*, *& propter aliud*, as your Application of the Medicine is. And I little doubt, but it is proper to say, He that hath the Medicine, and will not apply it, dies for want of Application; and he that doth apply it, recovers in one respect, through the Medicine; in another, because he applied it. I think we are agreed, how much of the praise belongs to the Medicine, and how much to the Application: And then for the *term* [*Righteousness,*] we shall see what the Scripture saith of it anon, when your Exceptions more necessarily lead me to it.

xxx

xxx

Aphorism.

Page 108. *OUr Evangelical Righteousness is not without us in Christ, as our pro-legal Righteousness is; but consisteth in our own actions of Faith and Gospel-Obedience.*

Animadverſ.

That Righteouſneſs which the Goſpel doth not hold unto us, is our Evangelical Righteouſneſs, and that is a Righteouſneſs without us in Chriſt. It is Chriſt's Righteouſneſs which is imputed to us, and made ours to Juſtification. Chriſt's Satisfaction may be called both our Evangelical Righteouſneſs as being revealed and offered in the Goſpel, *Rom.* 1. 16, 17 and alſo [our Legal Righteouſneſs,] as being that which the Law requireth, and whereby it is ſatisfied, *Chriſt being the end of the Law for Righteouſneſs to every one that believeth* Rom. 10. 4. But otherwiſe the Scripture excludes Legal Righteouſneſs, and ſets up Evangelical Righteouſneſs, as that by which we muſt be juſtified, *Rom.* 10. 5, &c. *Phil.* 3. 9.

Reply.

You ſpeak my own words; yea, ſpeak more ſo Legal Righteouſneſs than I will. For I do no think, that Chriſt's Righteouſneſs of Satisfaction is that which the Law required (for it require *ſupplicium delinquentis, & non Mediatoris*;) nor ye that the Law was ſatisfied ſtrictly by it (except *quoa finem remotum:* For it is an Act of the *Rector above Laws*, to admit *Satisfaction*, which is *reddi tio æquivalentis*; and it ſuppoſeth a *Relaxation* the Law, and the Law cannot relax it ſelf:) An yet you ſeem to oppoſe me for ſpeaking of a *Lega Righteouſneſs*. In what reſpect I call'd Chriſt's Satisfaction a [Legal Righteouſneſs] I told you fully; even the ſame in ſenſe, as you allow here.

Aphoriſm.

Page 110. *THe Righteouſneſs of the New-Covenant, beeing the performance of i Conditions*, &c.

Animadverſ.

This ſeems to be the πρῶτον ψεῦδος, the main thing whe in you miſtake. I ſhould diſtinguiſh betwixt the Righteo

1

es of the New-Covenant, and the *Condition* required of us hat we may partake of it. The Righteousnes of the first Covenant is personal Righteousnes performed by us, *Rom.* o. 5. The Righteousnes of the New-Covenant, is the Righteousnes of Christ imputed to us; but not except we believe n him, *Acts* 13. 39. I speak (as you do) of such Righteousnes as whereby we are justified.

Reply.

1. Can you give any tolerable Reason, why I nay not (at least) as fitly denominate *Righteousnes* from the several Covenants prescribing it, and o which it is conform, that is, from the most *immediate Foundation*; as you may denominate it from he *mere Offer or Discovery* in the Gospel to be *Evangelical* (that is, *ab accidente*) when you confes it is *Legal* in my sense (and more?) And yet his *tota lis est de nomine*.

If you say, Why do not I lay down *litem de nomine*, by speaking as others?

I answer, 1. Because Scripture speaks so before me. 2. It is necessary to the right unfolding the main Doctrine. 3. The Scripture-phrase is become so odious, and so great breaches are made in he Church, by deepest censuring those that use it, hat it is necessary to reassume it, and vindicate it. 4. It tends most potently to heal our breaches, *&c.* By the way here bear witnes, that where you give is much to Faith as I (to be the Condition) and o the *tota lis est de nomine justitiæ*, yet you say, his seems to be the πρῶτον ψεῦδος: So that my πρῶτον ψεῦδος is of no higher a nature than *de nomine*, if it be an error, as you deem.

2. But why speak you nothing to discover this Master-falshood? yea, when I laid so plain a ground or it, which you deny not, *viz.* from the very de-

scription of Righteousness, of one sort, and in the most usual sense? But I think I have said enough before to vindicate it.

Aphorism.

Page 111. TO *affirm, That our Evangelical, or New-Covenant Righteousness is in Christ, and not in our selves*, &c. 1. *It implieth blasphemy against Christ, as if he had sin to repent of, pardon to accept*, &c.

Animadvers.

All this follows, if Faith be *our Evangelical Righteousness*: Not if it be (as it is) our Condition to be partakers of that Righteousness. That Righteousness is to be sought by Faith, therefore it is called, [Righteousness which is of Faith,] *Rom.* 10. 6. Righteousness by faith, *Gal.* 5. 5. The Righteousness of God which is by Faith of Jesus Christ, *viz.* as the object of faith, not as the subject, *Rom.* 3. 22.

Reply.

You confess all that I say *de re*, but deny it *de nomine Justitiæ*. You confess, that all this Blasphemy follows, if we say, [*Christ repented and believed for us.* 2. For the name of [*Righteousness*,] the Texts you mention deny it not to Faith. It followeth not that the Condition of the New-Covenant is not Righteousness, because it is a Condition or means of our partaking of a further Righteousness. Yet this is all your arguing from the Scriptures cited; or else because [Christ's Satisfaction is our Righteousness, therefore there is no other subservient Righteousness] which is as weak.

Aphorism.

Page 118. IN *this fore-explained sense it is, that men are said to be personally righteous.*

Anim.

Animadver.

In the Scripture men are said to be personally righteous divers ways: 1. Comparatively, as being less unrighteous, *Gen.* 38. 26. 2. In some particular case, *Psal.* 7.8. & 18.20. 3. In respect of study and endeavour to conform to the Will of God in all things, *Luke* 1.6. But that any are so personally righteous, as that by their own personal righteousness they are simply and absolutely justified in the sight of God, this the Scripture doth not teach us, but is against it, *Psal.* 130.3,4. & 143. 2.

Reply.

1. Nor did ever I teach it: And yet one would think you intimate that I did. [*Simply and Absolutely*] are great words. I do not think that *Christ's Satisfaction* doth justifie us *simply and absolutely*: For then how can *Faith* be the Condition? It justifies no man for *non*-performance of the Condition finally: And he that *doth perform* it, needs no Justification for his *non*-performance; and therefore Christ's Satisfaction is not *so far* his Righteousness, and so not *simply* and *absolutely* his Righteousness. This is true, both of our Repentance, Faith, and sincere Obedience. Much less durst I ever think that our Faith is simply and absolutely our Righteousness, if thereby you mean as you seem to do, our *universal Righteousness materially.*

2. The comparative Righteousness which you mention, is *indeed no Righteousness.* And if you would make use of tropical terms, you might perhaps have found Unrighteousness it self, somewhere called Righteousness Ironically: Shall we therefore in Dispute say, Unrighteousness is Righteousness?

3. But your two last Concessions destroy your Cause: For both together make up the Righteousness of Faith which you deny. For, 1. It is

justitia causæ particularis, and not *universalis*; but then remember the distinction of *justitia particularis*, which I gave you before. It is such a *justitia particularis*, as our Salvation or Damnation will be determined by at Judgment. 2. And the matter of this *justitia particularis*, is sincere Obedience added to Faith; which Obedience consisteth in that endeavour to conform to God's Will, which you express.

Aphorism.

Page 120. *But if you consider our actions and persons in relation to the Rule of the New-Covenant, so all the Regenerate are personally righteous*, &c.

Animadvers.

But this personal Righteousness (I say still) is not that whereby we are justified, but that whereby we are sanctified; being indeed one and the same with Holiness: And therefore Righteousness and Holiness, or righteous and holy, are divers times in Scripture joyned together, as terms equivalent one to the other: Though in some respect they may be distinguished, *Luke* 1. 75. *Ephes.* 4. 24. *Psal.* 145. 17. *Rev.* 22. 11.

Reply.

1. I thought all this while you had denied the name of [*Righteousness*] to belong to it: But now I perceive you confess both the *name* and *nature*, *viz.* that it is *Righteousness*: Only you deny, that we are *justified by it*; whereby you have saved me the labour that I intended of proving it further to be Righteousness.

2. But is it not a strange *Righteousness*, that will *not justifie?* either you mean, that [we are not *universally* justified by it;] and that I know no man that will affirm. Or you mean, that we are not justified by it against the *Accusation* of being *breakers of the first Law*: But so we are justified by it only

as

as *the Condition* of our interest in Christ. Or else you mean, that we are not *at all justified by it*, that is, not against the Accusation of *non-performing the Conditions of the New-Covenant*; (and this you must mean, or you speak not to me:) And this is very untrue. For, 1. If you mean it of *Justification constitutive*, then to say, [*It is Righteousness, but will not justifie*;] is all one as to say, [*It is whiteness, but makes not white*:] [It is *paternitas vel filiatio, sed non constituit patrem vel filium*; *sanctitas, sed non constituit sanctum*] [*est forma, sed non informat*] But [*formam sequi debet nomen.*] If you mean it only *de Justificatione per sententiam judicis*, then it is as much as to say, [*We are constituted righteous hereby, but shall not be judged to be so*;] *i.e.* the Judg will not judg the *righteous* to be *righteous*, so far as he *truly is righteous*. He that saith to the *righteous*, [*Thou art wicked,*] is not the Judg that must judg the World.

3. You will oppose [*that whereby we are justified,*] to [*that whereby we are sanctified,*] as if the same thing might not do both. It constituteth us *holy*, as it is a sanctifying quality. It denominateth us *Righteous*, as it is the *subjectum primum*, or *matter* of our *non-Reatus*.

4. The Texts cited make not *Righteousness* and *Holiness* so far separate as you confess; nor yet *equipollent* terms; but only to be *concomitant*, and both together a fit description of God's people: Scripture doth not so ordinarily tautologize, nor is it to be imagined.

5. *Righteousness* and *Holiness* are not all one, so much as *materially*. For the matter of our *Righteousness* is our fulfulling of the *Condition as such*; which

which is done by the sincerity of Faith and Obedience, if there were no more: But the matter of our *Holiness* lieth in our qualities and actions as they respect the *Precept* or Rule; and so they may contain in them more than mere sincerity.

Aphorism.

Page 121. I *Have been sorry to hear many Learned Teachers speak thus.*

Animadvers.

You mean, that our personal inherent Righteousness is imperfect; and truly I am sorry that any Learned Teacher should dislike this. This personal Righteousness is the same with Holiness, however you would make them to differ; and Holiness here is but in perfecting, it is not perfected, 2 *Cor.* 7. 1.

Reply.

I mean as I speak; and that was, [*that any should say, That the godly are denominated Righteous (personally) only because their Sanctification and Good-works have some imperfect agreement to the Law of Works:*] And so that we are *legally righteous* in our selves.

2. I think I have plainly shewed you, that Holiness and Righteousness differ *toto cœlo formaliter*; and *much*, though not *wholly*, *materialiter*. Why did you not manifest the unsoundness of the differences which I expressed, but barely deny it? *Holiness* is imperfect, but *Righteousness* is *formaliter* perfect, or none at all: Yea, the *forma subjecti primi*, called the *materia*, is perfect too; for it lieth in the *Metaphysical Truth* of our [*performing the Condition as such*;] and therefore is convertible with the *entity* of that performance. But the *actions* whereby we so perform the Condition, are *not perfectly holy*; that is, they are not perfectly conform to the *Precept*,

Precept, though they are *perfectly*, that is, *truly* a performing of the *Condition*, and so conform to the act of the Law which constituteth that Condition.

Aphorism.

Page 122. *Righteousness signifying a Conformity to the Rule; and a Conformity with a* quatenus *or an imperfect Rectitude, being not a true Conformity and Rectitude at all (because the Denomination of the whole action or person, and not of a certain part or respect;) therefore imperfect Righteousness is not Righteousness, but Unrighteousness: It is a Contradiction in* adjecto.

Animadverf.

I see not but that an imperfect Conformity to the Rule, may denominate a man righteous, though not perfectly righteous; as well as imperfect Qualifications (which you grant) may denominate one holy, though not perfectly holy: These two [Qualification] and [Conformity to the Rule,] being indeed the same. For what is the Qualification of the Soul, which makes it holy, but the Rectitude of it, and its Conformity to the Rule? which makes it righteous? And are not the wills of the Regenerate made comformable to the will of God, in some measure, and yet not in full measure? Was there not some Conformity to the Law in *Paul*, when he could say, *I delight in the Law of God after the inward man?* But was this a perfect Conformity when he was forced to say, *But I see another Law in my members*, &c. *Rom.* 7. 22, 23.

Reply.

1. That which you say you see not, is very discernable, if you will well consider what is before said. As *Schibler* saith, *de Similitudine*, in the place I cited, if you speak *stricte & Philosophice viz. de ipsa relatione, relatio non intenditur nec remittitur:* And so imperfect Conformity is a contradiction, as is imperfect Similitude: But if you speak vulgarly and laxly, not *de ipsa relatione, sed de relationis subjecto*,

jecto, quando fundatur in qualitate, you may say, *Relatio recipit magis & minus*, because that *Quality* doth so: And in this sense I grant, that *Paul's* good actions (and all the Saints) are conform in part (that is, draw near to Conformity to the Law of Works;) when speaking properly, they are Inconform. *Vide Schibler. Met. l. 2. c. 8. punct. 2. n. 199. & c. 9. Tit. 7. Art. 2.* he saith, it is but *Locutio popularis & non Philosophica* to say, *Similitude is intended and remitted*: And saith, that *æqualitas consistit in indivisibili & quasi centro. Vid. Topic. c. 22. Vid. Suar. Metaph. Disp. 48. §. 18, 34. Aquinas* saith, (though the contrary laxer speech may pass) *Relationes non recipiunt magis & minus, 12æ. q. 82. a. 4. c.*

3. But you must further remember, that this *relation* of [*Righteous,*] in the sense of the Law of Works, *fundatur non solum in Qualitate, sed & in Quantitate: Et relata quorum fundamentum est quantitas non recipiunt magis & minus, inquit Alsted. Metaph. & omnes Metaphysici uno ore.* This Righteousness is *quædam Æqualitas:* And *Equality* is founded in Quantity. *Bellarmine* himself could confess *(de Justif. l. 1. c. 1.) Porro justitia unde Justificatio nomen habet, nihil aliud est nisi ordinis Rectitudo: Id enim est justum quod rectum & Adæquatum & cum sua regula optimè congruens.*

If therefore our Question be but of *one action*, that action is not *strictly Conform* to the *Law of Works* (the Precept) which is not *perfectly Conform*: But when we speak not of *one action*, but of the *Righteousness* of the person which is denominated from *all his actions* together, I thought the case had then been unquestionable, That there is none righteous,

no

no not one. Do you indeed hold, that a ſinner is truly righteous according to the Law of Works? If he be: 1. It is either with that Righteouſneſs which is a Conformity to the *Precept* as *Precept*, and is oppoſite to *Reatus culpæ*: (But that is utterly untrue, becauſe though the actions admit of *magis & minus*; yet *Conformity* and *relative Equality* do not, but ſtand *in centro*. And it is a perfect conformity, which that Law will call a Conformity, and doth expreſly require.) 2. Or it is with that Righteouſneſs which is in the performing of the *Condition*, and is oppoſed to *Reatus non præſtitæ conditionis*: (But that's as untrue; for in that Law, the *Precept* and *Condition* are both of an extent: The Condition is only *perfect Obedience*.) 3. Or it is with that Righteouſneſs which conſiſteth in *non-dueneſs of Puniſhment*, and is oppoſite to *Reatus pœnæ*: (But if that were but materially in imperfect works, according to the tenor of that Law, then Chriſt died in vain: And it is the perſon, and not the actions, that is the ſubject of that.)

4. You ſay, [*Qualification and Conformity*] *is the ſame.* Even as *Albedo* and *Similitudo*, or as *Subjectum & Accidens*, or as *Quantity* and *Relation* are the ſame.

You ask, [*What is the Qualification which makes it holy, but the Rectitude and Conformity to the Rule, which makes it righteous?*]

I reply, 1. If you take Holineſs (as now we do) for a *Quality*, then no relation doth conſtitute it certainly. But that Quality may be part of the matter or ſubject of the relation. 2. It's true, that *the Subjectum primum*, or the *materia* of our *Righteouſneſs* (now pleaded for) is the Conformity of our actions

actions and disposítions to the Rule. But the Question (you well know) is, To what Rule? And I say, 1. Not to the Law of Works. 2. Not to the Precept of the Gospel as such, in its fulness. 3. But to the *New-covenant*, as instituting the *Condition* of our participation of Christ. Our *Holiness* is the *matter* (as it is sincere, not as in this or that further degree) as it consisteth in *Faith* and *Repentance*, and *sincere Obedience*, which is conform to the *New-Law quoad Conditionem*; but it is not the Conformity it self, much less is it the Righteousness of the person, that is *formaliter* the *non-Reatus pœnæ Legis novæ*: Least of all is it a Conformity to the *Law of Works*, perfect or imperfect (for such there is none.) Yet if you will say, *In sensu populari & impropriâ* (as *Schibler* calls it) *& non Philosophica*, that our Holiness is imperfectly conform to the preceptive part of the New or Old Law, I will not contend about it. Only I must still desire you to know, that by [*Evangelical personal Righteousness*,] I mean, not *Holiness* in that sense; but I mean, *formaliter* our *non-Reatus pœnæ Evangelicæ: Et fundamentaliter*, 1. Our *Conformity* to that Law, as requiring the *Condition only*: And, 2. The *ipsa Conditionis præstatio*, wherein that *Conformity* doth consist: In a word, that we are not *rei non-præstitæ Conditionis*.

But because you so verily think, that the Law of Works doth call all Saints *truly righteous*, though *imperfectly*, I desire you to tell me these things: 1. Doth not Christ justifie the unrighteous, as to Legal Righteousness? How then do you prove them righteous according to that Law? 2. If the Law of Works call them truly righteous, then it will justifie them: For it cannot but justifie the just.

3. Doth

3. Doth not *James* ſay, he that offendeth in one, is guilty of all? How then can that Law know ſuch a thing as imperfect Righteouſneſs? 4. Doth not God ſay, *Prov.* 24. 24. *He that ſaith to the wicked,* [*Thou art righteous*] *Nations ſhall curſe him,* &c. *And he that juſtifieth the wicked, and condemneth the righteous, even they both are abomination to the Lord.* But if the Law pronounce an imperfect Obeyer righteous, and yet condemn him to Hell, it condemneth the righteous. 5. May not the damned and Devils be pronounced righteous by the Law of Works in your ſenſe? If any degree of (or rather towards) Conformity, give that title? And ſo alſo of all that periſh. For they do ſomewhat, in ſome reſpect, which the Law requireth: For I hope you will not ſay as the Phariſees, that the perſon is *righteous*, if *moſt* of his actions were *good*; and *unrighteous*, when moſt are bad, as *Paulus Burgenſ.* reprehends them (*Addit. in Lyram in Jacob.* againſt *Rab. Moſes*, and other of his Countrymen.) And *Burgenſ.* thinks *James* wrote purpoſely againſt that Doctrine. However you know, that the beſt man hath more faulty actions than faultleſs; nay, the beſt man never did one work which the Law of Innocency will call juſt, *Vid. Melanct. Loc. Com. de bonis operib. p.* 311. *Piſcat. Calv. Bulling. Pellican. Brochmond. &c. in Jac.* 2. 10. Dr. *Twiſs* ſaith, *Vindic.* Grat. l. 2. part. 1. c. 15. p. mihi 214. Col. 2. *Ad bonitatem moris quod attinet, falſum eſt actus iſtos bonos eſſe. Bonum enim non niſi ex integra cauſa conſtat: At ex quolibet defectu malum. Et quomodo dicantur illi, per ſe boni quos agnoſcimus æternæ damnationis meritorios? Falſum eſt eum qui dat Eleemoſynam vanæ gloriæ ſtudio, bonum*

actum

actum præstare, ut probatum est. Quod vero addit [*sed perversè*] *perversè facit. Hoc enim innuit, eundem actum posse esse & moraliter bonum, & moraliter malum: quod falsum est.* Christ doth not out of the same mouth send forth Blessing and Cursing. There is no middle here with us, between Guilty, and Not-guilty, that is, Righteous. Indeed, as *Dissimilitude* and Inequality have degrees, though strictly *Similitude*, *Equality* and *Conformity* have none; so Unrighteousnes hath degrees. The action also of a Devil may be just, and justified *secundum quid*, in some respect; but that denominateth not the action *righteous*, much less the Actor. I conclude with two Learned mens words: *Neque putandum est fieri posse ut per Legem, saltem aliqua ex parte justificemur*; (therefore we are not *aliqua ex parte justi.*) *Nam aut Legem transgressus es, aut non. Si non es Legem transgressus, Lege Justificaris: si transgressus es, Condemnaris. Inter Legis transgressionem & non-transgressionem, nihil potest esse medium. Itaq; aut omnino, aut nullo modo Lege Justificamur (vel justi sumus.)* Placæus Thes. Salmurienf. Vol. 1. p. 29. §. 13.

And *Wotton* saith (*de Reconcil. part.* 2. *l.* 1. *c.* 5. *n.* 16.) *The Righteousness, whereof the Law is the Rule, is not the Righteousness of him that hath once transgressed the Law.* And *ibid. n.* 4. [*Where Righteousness, which is the way to life eternal, is the same, the Covenant of God concerning the obtaining eternal life must be the same. For the Covenant is divers, according to the nature of that Righteousness which is understood to be its Condition; seeing it is evident, that the Covenant doth depend upon its Condition, and from it, as it were, borrows its nature. But in the*

Law

Law and the Gospel, there is not the same Covenant for obtaining eternal life, Gal. 3. 17. *How therefore can the same Righteousness be said to be required in the Law and the Gospel, when it is most evident that the Covenants are divers, or rather opposite. So far* Wotton.

Aphorism.

Page 123. I *Could here heap up a multitude of Orthodox Writers, that do call our personal Righteousness by the title of Evangelical, as signifying by what Rule it doth receive its name.*

Animadvers.

But do these Orthodox Writers say, that we are *justified* by this Righteousness? Both imputed Righteousness and inherent (which is the same with personal) Righteousness, is Evangelical; *i. e.* such as the Gospel doth teach and require, though not both in a like manner; but the one unto Justification, the other unto Sanctification.

Reply.

1. But the present Question is, *By what Rule* we are denominated *inherently righteous?* A man would think that here you grant, that it is not by the *Law of Works*, but of *Grace*.

2. It is preposterous to say, the Law of Christ requireth *Righteousness* to *Sanctification* (in the common sence of the word *Sanctification*;) that is, the *form* to the *matter*, the *relation* to the *subject*: *Albedinem ad parietem, similitudinem ad albedinem, paritatem ad numeros, equalitatem ad quantitatem.* I should put the other end first.

3. He that affirms a man *righteous*, and yet denieth that he may thereby be *justified*, *so far* as he is righteous, contradicteth himself. If you think that by the words [*so far,*] I yield to different de-

grees of Righteousnes: I answer, Not *formaliter*, but only *subjectivè*, *vel materialiter*; and that only when a man hath *many causes*, or his Cause *many parts*; he may be righteous in one Cause, or one part of his Cause, and guilty in the rest. But take *every Cause*, or *part of his Cause* singly, and he is as to that either *Guilty* or *Not-guilty*, that is, *Righteous*. But as to the Law of Works, we are all guilty, and in respect of every action, though not each respect of each action: So that neither *person* nor *action* can by it be pronounced righteous. And our Righteousnes, or *non-Reatus pœnæ*, according to the Law of Grace, doth neither admit of degrees *formaliter*, *vel materialiter immediatè*, *sed tantum quoad materiam remotam*. For the *materia immediata* is *another relation* (*Conformity* to the Law as *instituting the Condition*:) and so it is *relatio fundata in relatione*. And this Condition again consisteth not in the *degree* of Holiness or Faith; but in the *sincerity* or *truth* of it. So that though *quoad sanctitatem*, a man may have more or less Faith and Obedience, yet *quoad impletionem conditionis* (which is not, to have *so much Faith*, but to *have Faith* in that degree as may constitute its *sincerity*) there is no degree: either we do fulfil it, or we do not, there is no *medium*.

Aphorism.

NO man is now under the Law as Adam was before the New-Covenant was made; or so under the Law alone, as to have nothing to do with the Gospel; or so under the first Law, as to have no benefit by the new.

Anim.

Animadverf.

None are so under the Law or Old-Covenant, as to have no relief from the Gospel, if they will fly to it, and embrace it. But all that remain in unbelief, are so far under the Old-Covenant, as to have no benefit by the Gospel or New-Covenant, because the benefit is only to those that believe: Faith being the Condition of the New-Covenant, and no benefit is to be had by it, without performing the Condition of it; I speak of the Covenant as conditional; for otherwise it is also absolute, so as to promise that which it requireth, *Jer.*31.33. *Heb.*8.10.

Reply.

I think we differ not in this in sense. But, 1. I speak here (and most usually) not of the Covenant as it is accepted by man, and so is mutual: But as it is propounded and enacted by God, and offered, and so is the same with the New-Law, consisting of Precept and Sanction. 2. So that here I included that Mercy, which in order to the special blessings of the Covenant, the Mediator of the Covenant doth offer and give to men. And so, 1. The very *Law* or *Covenant* it self is a mercy to wicked men, however their abuse or rejection may make it their ruine. The matter of it containeth unspeakable mercies, even Pardon and Salvation; and for the extent of it, it is universal, and excludeth none: Though the *Promulgation* extend not to all, the *tenor* of the Covenant or Promise in it self doth. All have there a conditional Pardon and Grant of Salvation freely given them under the hand of God: And though their unbelief deprive them of the actual enjoyment, yet the Grant (conditional) is even to the wicked an unspeakable mercy; or else the rejecting of it would not be so great a sin, nor so torment them for ever. 2. And there are other benefits subservient and additional, which the worst may receive. As to live among the godly, and

have their teaching, and examples, and prayers; to have the preaching of the Word, to have external and internal common mercies, leading to Repentance. These are not given merely to Believers, or on Condition of Faith. 3. The like may be said of those great mercies which are the foundation of the New-Covenant; *viz.* The Death of Christ, which was a Satisfaction sufficient for the sins of the whole World, and in some sort was made for all. 4. Yet I agree with you fully (and often so expressed my self) that Unbelievers are under the Curse of the Law, and unpardoned, and without right to Salvation.

Aphorism.

Page 125. *Faith is our Evangelical Righteousness*, &c.

Animadvers.

Faith is the Condition whereby we obtain Evangelical Righteousness: Which Righteousness is indeed Christ's Satisfaction; only Faith is required of us, that this Righteousness may be imputed to us.

Reply.

Enough is said to this before, 1. *Christ's Satisfaction* is *strictly* our *Legal Righteousness*, as you confessed; because it is a Satisfaction to the Law of Works (as you speak) or to God as Legislator and Judg according to that Law: But *accidentally* it may be called our *Evangelical Righteousness*, because the Gospel *revealeth* and *conferreth* it.

2. Faith is no part of this *Legal Righteousness*, nor tends to *satisfie God's justice*, nor *deserves* any thing of him; but is (as you truly say) the Condition only of our enjoying it.

3. This

3. This *Condition* is imposed by a *New-Law*, which was made for the right conveyance of the fruits of Christ's Satisfaction: And so is the *Righteousness* of that New-Law, as the performance of the Condition of a Law-Testament or Covenant, is that which it denominateth Righteous. And so you confess Faith to be our Evangelical Righteousness, when-ever you confess it to be the Condition of that Law or Covenant. And when the case in question is, Whether we have performed or fulfilled the Condition of Christ's New-Law or Covenant? then Faith is that Righteousness by which materially we must be justified, or we perish. This is the sum of all in brief.

Aphorism.

Page 127. *Whosoever will accept him, and believe in him, who hath thus satisfied, it shall be as effectual for their Justification, as if they had fulfilled the Law of Works themselves.*

Animadverf.

Well, yet not properly the accepting Christ, but his Satisfaction accepted of us, and imputed to us, is that whereby we are justified: As it is not properly the accepting of a gift, but the gift it self that doth enrich; though it must be accepted that it may do it. This similitude seems more suitable, than that of the pepper-corn which you use.

Reply.

Why did you not set against the Distinction and Explication that I gave, *p.* 127, 128? In point of *Satisfaction*, *Merit* or *Value*, *Acceptance*, i. e. *Faith*; is no part of our Righteousness. But God resolved there should be *some Condition* of our *personal performance* to make that *ours*, which *naturally* was *none of ours*, but performed by *another*: And so in

that respect, *Faith it self* is imputed to us instead of the *personal performance* of perfect Obedience, that is, it shall as fully serve to our Justification. In our *perfect personal Obedience* to the Law of Works, these two would have been conjoyned, the *Value*, and the *personal Performance*: But now *Christ's Satisfaction* is the *whole* in point of *value* or *merit*; but he bought us to *his service*, and he resolveth that somewhat of *our own performance* shall intercede as a *Condition*. And so *Faith* is as effectual or sufficient a *Condition* under the New-Covenant, as *perfect Obedience* would have been under the Old; and Christ's Satisfaction is of as full a *value* now, as that Obedience would have been then. I thought this had been plain, easie, true Scripture-Doctrine. And so I see no unfitness in my similitude of a Pepper-corn, so be it you will do me that Justice, as to understand that I do by it only include the *necessity* of the Act of *Homage*, or acknowledgment of the Redeemers Dominion, and our subjection thereto, and that I exclude the *rationem pretii*. And if the *valuableness* of a *Pepper-corn* should make you think otherwise (contrary to the expres words of my Application) you shall change the name to *a grain of Sand*, or a *verbal Acknowledgment*. And yet (be it spoken in your ear) when we preach *ad populum* of the necessity of Striving, Running, using Violence for Heaven, working out our Salvation, forsaking all for Christ, suffering with him that we may reign with him, *&c.* we do not so scrupulously avoid all that may possibly intimate *rationem pretii*, as a poor Pepper-corn comes too. I well remember you once preached a Sermon with me at *Bridgnorth*, on that in *Ephesians*, [*See*

that

that ye walk circumspectly;] wherein you (learnedly, honestly and soundly) spake as much in the commendation of *Holy-walking*, as any phrase of a *Pepper-corn* intimates at least.

2. And for your fitter similitude, I say, it is easie to apprehend, that the Gift enricheth *quoad Dignitatem*; but the *Acceptance ut medium fruitionis*. But you must distinguish between a *gift absolutely given*, (wherein *accepting* is but *naturaliter* necessary, and in some cases not necessary at all;) and a *gift conditionally given*, *Acceptance* being the *Condition* (and given by a Law or Act of Grace;) wherein *Acceptance* is also *moraliter necessary* to the actual fruition. For in this latter case, the tryal of his Title in Law, depends mainly on the tryal and proof of this his Acceptance.

Aphorism.

Page 129. *THe value of Christ's Satisfaction is imputed to us, instead of the value of a perfect Obedience of our own performing.*

Animadvers.

And by this value of Christ's Satisfaction imputed to us, are we justified; not by our own personal performance of Faith properly, but only as it serves to make Christ's Satisfaction ours, whereas without Faith we have nothing to do with it.

Reply.

Your [*but only as*] contradicts your [*not properly.*] For it is proper to say, [*We are justified by Faith*] as a *Condition*; as it is to say, [*We are justified by Christ's Satisfaction*] as the *meritorious Cause*. Or else *Paul* (and all the Scripture) speaks oftner improperly than properly. For they never speak of being justified by Christ's Satisfaction (though there be that which is equivalent in other terms) but

many a time they speak of being justified by Faith. See *Wotton* of this.

Aphorism.

Page 131. *But whether all this Imperfection be privative and sinful*, &c. *is a question*, &c.

Animadvers.

I think there is no question to be made, but that the imperfection of Holiness, which doth proceed from admixture of contrary qualities (as immediately before you grant this doth) is sinful. For what qualities but sinful, are contrary to Holiness? And is not Imperfection sinful, which doth proceed from the admixture of sinful qualities? *Let us cleanse our selves* (saith the Apostle) *from all filthiness of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God*, 2 Cor. 7. 1. It is filthiness which abiding still in us, doth make our Holiness here imperfect: From which filthiness therefore we must still cleanse our selves, that our Holiness may be more and more perfect.

Reply.

1. *Concedo totum.* I never intended to speak otherwise: When I said, [*It is a question which will be decided, when I speak of the extent of the Command or Rule,*] I intended the confuting more fully of them that are otherwise minded, and not to make it doubtful.

2. Yet upon review, as the words lie, I must maintain the Negative in some sense. For the doubt is, Whether *all* this Imperfection be sinful? But as it is imperfect *participative & efficienter*, so it is not sinful: For so it is considered only as an imperfect work of God's Spirit, that is, a work which he hath begun, but not yet finished: And as so related to him it is not sinful; for he was not bound to perfect it sooner, or to sanctifie us all at once in perfection.

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Page 132. *Righteousnes is not a quality, as Holiness is; but the Modification of our Acts as to the Rule, which is not varied* secundum magis & minus.

Animadverf.

For any thing I yet see, a thing may be more or less conformed to its Rule; and Righteousnes (being understood of that which is inherent and personal) is really the same with Holiness, as I have noted before. Neither should you (as you seem to do) appropriate Righteousnes more than Holiness to our Actions: There is habitual Righteousnes, as well as actual, and actual Holiness, as well as habitual. Righteousnes and Holiness equally agree, both to our persons, and to our actions, *Ephes.* 4. 24. & 1 *Pet.* 1. 15.

Reply.

1. If we speak of *Conformity to a Rule* in general, when that *Relation* is founded in *Quality*, which admitteth of *Intension* and *Remission*, then *subjectivè vel materialiter*, the *Relation* may be said to be *intended or remitted*; but not *formaliter*, *vel quoad esse relationis*. I cannot more fully express this, than in *Schibler's* words, Metaph. l. 2. c. 9. Tit. 7. A. 2. *Dico 2. quod etiam relata ex parte sui, hoc est, secundum esse relationis ipsius, non suscipiunt magis & minus. Intensio (n.) facit ut entitas subjecto conveniat perfectiore modo, & remissio ut modo imperfectiore. At similitudo & æqualitas; v.g. consistunt in indivisibili: veluti si quæ conveniunt simpliciter in forma aliqua dicuntur similia: & si habeant eandem quantitatem dicuntur paria: & hinc paritas vel æqualitas adeo exactam convenientiam significant, & nullam prorsus latitudinem admittat illa æqualitas. Atq; hinc imprimis hoc dictum* Aristotelis *intelligendum est juxta popularem modum loquendi (viz. Relata suscipere intensionem & remissionem) quo* Arist. *in Categoriis sæpius*

usus

usus est, prout interpretatur Tolet. Conimbric. Fonseca, *&c. Potest autem istud loquendi genus fundari in similitudinibus, v. g. discretis : veluti conveniunt alicui rei plura attributa : veluti homini, esse, vivere, intelligere, &c. Hinc igitur homo, v. g. est similior Deo quam lapis, quia pluribus attributis Deo convenit quam lapis : sic siqui conveniant in eadem ætate & statura & doctrina, æqualiores sunt quam si in sola ætate æquentur. 2. Potest ea æqualitatis (de ea enim potissima est difficultas) intensio & remissio fundari in majori recessu ab extremo. Etsi (n.) æqualitas præcisè sit quasi in centro posita, tamen isto populari genere loquendi illud censebitur æqualius alii quod ab extremo magis ad centrum vergit. Veluti, si numerus aliquis sit, ut decem, in duobus extremis est æqualitas, &c. Hic numerus ad novem æqualior est istis quam numerus ad quatuor : quia novem magis recedunt ab extremo, h. e. ab uno, quam quatuor. Cum alias absolute & Philosophicè loquendo, hic nulla simpliciter sit æqualitas.*

2. If you speak of Conformity to the Rule of *Precept* as such, the same Answer serves: It may be conform *in pluribus vel paucioribus partibus materiæ*, but those are formaliter *conformitates discretæ*. But yet though *de posse* I say, [*it may be*] *de facto*.] I say, in our case it *is not* so: For the Act is not *divisible into parts conform*, and *parts inconform*; and no man ever performeth one act fully and exactly conform to the Law of Works, or (I think) to the preceptive part of Christ's Law as such. But if this were otherwise, it were nothing to our business: For this is not *our Righteousness*.

3. But (as I have told you) our Righteousness is *formaliter non reatus pœnæ*; And is there any degrees of that? Every man is *Guilty*, or *Not-guilty*.

Guilty

Guilty is varied, both as to the several causes or parts thereof, and the several degrees of penalty due: But when the cause is one, and it is one penalty that we are accused to be liable to, we can be but *Not-guilty*; and if we are not so, we are *Guilty*. 2. This *Not-guiltiness*, as it respecteth the penalty of the Law of Works, is *fundamentaliter* from the gift of the Law of Grace. And there is here no degrees; either Christ and his Righteousness is imputed and given to us, or not; but not with a *magis* or *minus*. 3. This Righteousness is *materialiter* in *Christ's Satisfaction*; and that also is not varied, though he might have satisfied for some sins or persons only, yet he hath done it fully; And between satisfying and not-satisfying, there is no mean; nor is this the Righteousness now in question.

4. This Righteousness is *conditionaliter* in *our Faith*; or rather, *our Faith* is the *Condition* of it. And this admits not of degrees: For it is the *least degree* of *sincere Faith* that is the *Condition*; and the highest degree is no more, nor will justifie more. The strongest Believer doth believe more than the weakest; but doth not more *perform the Condition of Justification*. For it is the verity of that Faith, which the Gospel hath made the Condition, which is our sincerity; and this is convertible with the Entity.

5. And for the Righteousness which is opposed to *Reatus pœnæ novæ Legis*, it is a relation founded in another relation (Conformity;) and that Conformity is not to the Precept as such, but to the Law as requiring the Condition (which great Divines call the specifick form of the Covenant or Law;) and this Condition is our Righteousness in the sense explained, and admits not of degrees as a Condition, as is last said.

Though

Though if you go yet further from the form, and consider our Gospel-Righteousness neither *in esse non Reatus pœnæ*, nor *in esse relativo Conformitatis ad Legem conditionem instituentem*, nor *in esse reali Conditionis-præstitæ*, but *in esse Officii*, as related to, or measured by the *Precept*, and that only *quoad materiam Præceptam*; so I confess that our Faith and Holiness admit of degrees. And I think this Answer is plain, and the distinction necessary, and not vainly nice.

2. And where you still say, that Holiness and Righteousness is all one; I have told you (I think sufficiently) a wide difference. If you take Holiness for passive Dedication to God, or the Relation of a thing consecrated or separated to God; so I told you it is indeed a *Relation*, but not the same with *Righteous*: If you take it for the *Quality* of our new-spiritual life; or the Habits of Grace, so it is *materially* the same thing with part of our Evangelical Righteousness in question, but not *formally*; nay, nor *materially*, as it is considered in any high degree, but merely as *Sincere*. If you consider it as those *actions* which are *commanded*, it is *materially another* part of our Righteousness: For it is the same act which the Law makes a Condition, which it also makes to be *Officium*; and it is *first Officium* in order of nature, and then *Conditio*. But there is more made *Officium*, than is made the *Condition* properly and *per se*. But you after seem to take [*Holiness*] *formaliter* in a sense yet differing from all these; that is, as it is the *Conformity* (perfect or imperfect) of *Habits* or *Actions* to the *Rule*: The same with *bonum Morale*, as opposite to *sin*. And so it seems to me, you make all the *good actions*

of

of the *Heathens holy*: for you think, that an *exact Conformity* is not the only *true Conformity*. But in this sense (if it be *good*) Holiness and Righteousness much differ: It is indeed the same with that Righteousness which is opposed to *Reatus culpæ*; (if any man were found that had any such Righteousness according to the Law of Works, when indeed the best are but less unrighteous.) But it is not the same with [*performance of the Condition*] *formally*; much less the same formally with our *non-Reatus pœnæ*. Holiness in your sense as *bonum*, is denominated from its congruency to the *Precept* as a *Precept*: But I hope you will acknowledg a wide difference between those two Acts of the New-Law, *instituere Officium*, and *instituere Conditionem*; between; [*Do this,*] simply taken; and, [*Do this, and live.*]

3. Your Charge (of my placing Righteousness only in *Acts*, and Holiness in *Habits*) is utterly against my oft express words. I say of Righteousness, *p.* 132. that [*it is the relative consideration of these Qualities,* &c.] p. 134. that [*it may be materially considered in Holiness,*] and divers the like. Yet let me tell you, that (though the Precept do require *Habits*, whatsoever *L. V.* in *Crellio Refutato* say to the contrary, yet) he that should maintain against you, that it is not *habitual Faith*, but *actual*, which is properly *& in se*, the *Condition* of the Covenant, would put you hard to it; and perhaps not cross your own, or the common Principles; though I am not now of that opinion which excludes the Habit.

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *OUr Divines usually say, That our Justification is perfect, though our Sanctification be not; and then I am sure our Righteousness must be perfect.*

Animadvers.

True: Our Righteousness whereby we are justified must be perfect. But our Divines you know hold, that the Righteousness whereby we are justified, is not our personal Righteousness, but the Righteousness of Christ through faith imputed to us; neither do I as yet see any cause to desert this Doctrine.

Reply.

I must say, that I like not the saying that our Justification is perfect, for many Reasons: But you grant as much as I desire for the *major* Proposition, [*That the Righteousness whereby we are justified must be perfect:*] And I think I have proved the *minor* already, [*But the performing the Condition of the New-Covenant, is a Righteousness by which we must be justified*;] viz. in *subordination* to Christ's Righteousness; that is, against the *Accusation* of being *rei pœnæ novæ Legis*, for *non*-performance of its Conditions. And methinks it should need no proof: But yet I am willing that this phrase be be cast aside, lest it be misunderstood.

Aphorism.

Page 133. *SIncerity is usually said to be our Gospel-perfection; not as it is accepted instead of perfection, but as it is truly so. For sincere Faith is our Conformity to the Rule of Perfection*, viz. *The New-Covenant as it is a Covenant.*

Anim.

Animadverſ.

Sincerity is ſuch perfection as doth conſiſt with imperfection: For one is more or leſs ſincere, as more or leſs free from admixtures of Hypocriſie, and ſo more or leſs perfect. Neither can you (I think) evade by your diſtinction which you add immediately after; *viz.* That ſincere Faith as ſuch, is only materially our Righteouſneſs and Perfection; but formally, as it's relatively our Conformity to the ſaid Rule. For (ſo far as I can yet diſcern) Conformity to a Rule doth not conſiſt in ſuch an indiviſible point, but that there may be degrees of it: So that one may be more or leſs (perſonally) righteous, as well as more or leſs holy. And ſo much may be underſtood by that, *Rev.*22.11. *Let him that is righteous, be righteous ſtill; and let him that is holy, be holy ſtill*; *i. e.* Let him not only continue righteous and holy, but alſo labour to be more righteous and holy: And doth not the Apoſtle require of thoſe that are righteous and holy, that they be *renewed in the ſpirit of their mind, and put on the new-man, which after God is created in Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs?* Epheſ.4.23,24.

Reply.

1. I doubt not but *ſincerity of Righteouſneſs* conſiſteth with *imperfection of Holineſs*, or of the *matter* of that Righteouſneſs. Sincerity is taken by Divines: 1. For a *Moral Vertue* (or if you will, a ſpiritual Grace.) 2. For the *Metaphyſical Verity* of that Grace which we have. And thus they doubly uſe the word [*Hypocriſie*:] 1. For that Vice, which makes a man deſire and endeavour to ſeem better than he is. 2. For a ſeeming or appearing better than we are, or to do what we do not, though without affectation or diſſimulation: For the falſity of that ſeeming-ſincerity as a Vertue, is oppoſed to the firſt kind of Hypocriſie, *viz.* as a particular Vice; and thus you ſeem to take it: And ſo no doubt

All this is but a ſtriſe about the word [*Perfect.*] And I repent that I uſed the word, becauſe moſt may miſtake it, and it may do harm.

doubt but *Sincerity* may be more or less, as it hath less or more *Hypocrisie* mixt with it. If you take it in the second sense, so *Sincerity* is no *particular Vertue* (nor the opposite *Hypocrisie* any *particular Vice*) but the *Metaphysical Truth* of our *Vertues*, which is nothing really distinct from them. But thus it is not very proper to speak of the *admixture of Hypocrisie*, *q.d.* a mixture of Verity and Falsity, Entity and *non*-Entity. But let that pass.

This *last Sincerity* is, 1. Either the *Sincerity*, or *Truth* of the *Habit* or *Act* in its *Physical* Consideration: (And so the Acts or Habits may be encreased, but the Metaphysical Truth of each particular or degree is still a Concomitant *modus* of the Being, not capable of Intension or Remission in it self immediately, but as the Entity is intended or remitted.) 2. Or it is the truth of their Vertuousness or Goodness-Moral, which is their Denomination, as they are suited with the Precept, [*Do this:*] And so neither the Sincerity, nor the Goodness or Conformity have *formaliter* any Degrees; but *materialiter vel subjectivè* (they may, and commonly be, so spoke of, because *vel plures*, *vel pauciores materiæ partes sunt conformes regulæ:*) But in our case, as to the Divine Rule, I have told you before, how inconform we are, and all our actions. But yet this is not the Sincerity that I speak of. 3. Sincerity therefore is taken here by me, for the *Metaphysical Truth of our performance of the Condition of the Covenant*. And therefore I said, [*It is our Conformity to the Rule*; viz. *the Covenant as a Covenant*,] to distinguish it from Conformity to the *preceptive* part as such. This is the *Sincerity* of our Graces or Duties, not *Physically*, as Habits or Acts

(that

(that is presuppos'd) not *morally*, *quoad præceptum* only, as vertuous or good: 4. But *savingly*, *quoad conditionem*: As I have more fully opened to you in *Chap.* 11. of my *Treat. of Rest*, *Edit.* 2, & 3. whither I must refer you for a fuller Explication of my sense of this. Now in this sense Sincerity admits of *no degrees*; for there is no *medium* between *ens* and *non-ens*: And this Sincerity is but the Metaphysical Verity of that Faith (whether in kind or degree differing from other Faith, is nothing to this Controversie) which the Covenant hath made its Condition. Every man is either a sincere, that is, true performer of that Condition, or he is not; and no man is more truly a performer of it than other.

2. I have therefore over and over shewed you, that Conformity to the *Rule of the Condition*, doth consist in such an *indivisible punctum*, that though one may *præstare conditionem fortiùs & alacriùs* than another, yet none doth more truly perform it, or is more a performer of it, and consequently not more righteous in that sense. As our Divines use to say, A weak hand may as truly receive a Pearl, as a strong; and a weak Faith as truly receive Christ. If a Pearl be given to ten men, on condition they take it; he that takes it feebly, hath as good right to it, as he that grasps it hard: And if their right be called in Question, it will prove that the *Titulus* or *Conditio* was not strong apprehending, but apprehending; and therefore the case will not be, [Whether he *strongly*, but whether he *truly* took it?] And there will be no more, but a *Guilty*, or *Not-guilty* in that point of Verity, to *turn* all. If he *truly took* it, his cause is righteous, and there-

fore he is in that righteous, and therefore shall be justified.

3. I see not what the two Texts cited make against this: *Rev.* 22. 11. either speaks not of *encrease* of Righteousness, but *perseverance* (and yet it may of Holiness; for you know it is usual to vary the sense of the same Adjunct or Precept, according to the variety of subjects:) Or, 2. If it speak of Righteousness *in esse materiali & non formali*, that is nothing against what I say. I am sure it proves, that there is a true personal Righteousness in the Saints, and that cannot be *in sensu Legis operum*.

Ephes. 4. 23, 24. 1. The Apostle seems not to press on them a duty *de novo*, but to suppose that already done which he mentioneth: [*If so be that ye have heard of him, and have been taught by him, as the truth is in Jesus, that ye put off the old man*, &c.

2. If it be not so, yet [*putting off the old man, and putting on the new*,] is usually spoke to those that yet have not put on the new. And *Paul* wrote to more than sincere Christians, though to none but Professors.

3. If you were sure he spoke to none but the Saints, yet the words imply not any encrease of their *Righteousness*, but of that *new man* which is *created in Righteousness* and *Holiness*; that is, whose nature and excellency consisteth in being *righteous* and *holy*: One of which may yet encrease, and not the other.

4. If yet this were otherwise, all that you can think to prove is, that the word [*Righteousness*] is used for the *matter*, and not the *form* of Righteousness.

5. *Righ-*

5. *Righteousnes* is oft taken in Scripture for that Vertue which consisteth in *tribuendo suum cuiq;*. And so especially, as it respecteth God; giving to God the things that are Gods, and to men, that which is mens; and consequently obeying him. But this is not the Righteousnes now in question.

In all this, Perfection is taken for reality of the relation only; And the strife is vain.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *OUr Righteousnes is perfect, as in its Being, so also in order to its end. The end is to be the Condition of our Justification*, &c.

Animadvers.

The end of our Faith is to be the Condition of our Justification; but not considered as it is our Righteousnes, *viz.* a part of our Inherent Righteousnes, but as it receives Christ the Lord our Righteousnes, *Jer.* 23. 6. *viz.* whereby we are justified.

Reply.

This is very true, as to the first Justification, from the Accusation of *Reatus pœnæ primæ Legis propter peccatum*: For so Faith justifies only as the *Condition* of our participation in Christ and his Righteousnes (which I am glad you grant:) But as to the second Justification, from the Accusation of *Reatus pœnæ novæ Legis ob non-præstitam conditionem*, Faith is *materially* that *our Righteousnes*. The confounding these two Justifications, and the confounding the Rule of Duty (*Precept*) and the Rule of the *Condition*, or the Law as instituting the Condition, and so the *præstatio Officii*, and *præstatio Conditionis*, is the thing that bringeth all this darkness into your discourse (as it appears to me.)

Aphorism.

Ibid. *SO that our Righteousness formally considered, in relation to the New-Covenant, is perfect, or none.*

Animadverſ.

1. Inherent Righteousness may be true, and yet imperfect, and that formally considered in relation to the New-Covenant. For the New-Covenant as it accepts of sincere Righteousness; so it requires an encrease of it, which needed not, nor could be, if it were perfect.

2. You speak of that Righteousness whereby we are justified, and suppose it to be Faith; whereas Faith is a hand to receive that Righteousness, that we may be justified by it.

Reply.

I will not molest you with repeating any more the former Reply: only consider, how *Reatus, vel non-Reatus pœnæ* can be *formaliter* encreased. And lest you think me singular in making *Righteousness* (of this sort) to consist in that, hear our Learned *Gataker* (specially well studied in these points) *cont. Lucium Vind. part.* 1. *sect.* 2. *n.* 34. *In re judiciariâ insons omnis pro justo habetur. Sons & insons sunt ex oppositis* ὧν ὀδὲν ἀνὰ μεσόν. So he interpreteth *Deut.* 25. 1. (ibid. n. 21. pag. 32.) *Si controversia inter aliquos extiterit & ad judcium res delata fuerit, justificent (judices scil.) eum qui justus (hoc est insons) fuerit, eum vero qui improbus (hoc est sons) fuerit condemnent.* Vid. & n. 19, 20. &c. p. 31. *Et idem contra Gomarum*, pag. 35, 36. *Non hoc dicitur, Deum apud se judicare illos pro quorum peccatis universis Christus satisfecit, nihil mali unquam commisisse, aut boni debiti omisisse: Sed eodem habere loco quoad mortis Reatum & jus ad vitam æternam, ac si nihil vel mali admisissent, vel boni debiti omisissent.*

Let

Let me add the words of *Placæus*, Thes. Salmuriens. Vol. 1. p. 27. *Justus sumi potest vel morali vel forensi significatione. Morali, ut opponitur τῷ ἀδίκῳ, eumq; significet qui præditus est virtute ea quæ justitia dicitur*, &c. *Forensi ut opponitur κατηγορουμένῳ καταδίκῳ, eumq; significet in quem Lege agere non licet; qui jure condemnari non potest à judice, nedum puniri: sic nos*, &c.

I have heard some object merely from the name, that this is to make Righteousnes to be only a Negation of guilt: But let them change the name, and call the guilty, *Non-justus*, or *Non-absolvendus*, and then they are pleased.

And let me note one thing more here, lest you should think this to be *Righteousnes nimis improprie sic dicta*; *viz.* that as Righteousnes is most *strictly in sensu forensi* opposed to *guilt*, so *guilt of punishment* is so properly called guilt, as well as *Reatus culpæ* is; that the *Reatus culpæ* alone is seldomer mentioned by Divine or Humane Writers, but they commonly define guilt (as if they took notice of no other sort) thus, *Reatus est obligatio ad pœnam.*

Aphorism.

Page 134. *But considered materially, as it is Holiness*, &c.

Animadvers.

Here you grant, that Righteousnes (*i.e.* personal inherent Righteousnes) is the same with Holiness, and so imperfect. For your distinction of Materiality and Formality of Righteousnes, I have said something to it before. Neither do I see but Holiness also may admit the same distinction. For though Holiness materially considered be a quality (as you say it is, *page* 132.) and so also is habitual Righteousnes, which is as you acknowledg, materially considered, nothing but Holiness; yet Holiness as well as Righteousnes formally considered, is a

Conformity to the Rule, viz. the Law of God. For Holiness is opposite to sin, and sin is a deviation from the Rule, therefore Holiness is a Conformity to it.

Reply.

I answered this particularly before. Holiness (in your sense, as you take it for *Goodness*) is a Conformity (*imperfect quoad partes vel respectus materiæ conformis*) to the Law, as it doth *constituere Debitum officii*: Righteousness is, 1. *Non-Reatus pœnæ.* 2. A Conformity to the Rule, as it constituteth *Conditionem præmii obtinendi, & pœnæ vitandæ*; or, as Divines use to say, as it is a *Covenant*, or respecteth the Sanction.

Aphorism.

Ibid. YEt *it is an improper speech of some Divines, that Christ first justifieth our persons, and then our duties and actions. And except by* [Justifying] *they mean his* esteeming them *to be a fulfilling of the* Gospel-Conditions, *and so just, it is unsound and dangerous, as well as improper.*

Animadvers.

I think those Divines mean thus: That in and through Christ, first our persons are *accepted* of God, and then our *performances:* And in this I see nothing improper, much less unsound and dangerous. *God hath made us accepted in the Beloved*, Ephes. 1. 6. and as us, so also our services: *Our spiritual Sacrifice is acceptable to God through Christ*, 1 Pet. 2. 5. And the acceptation of our persons, is before the acceptation of our performances: *The Lord had respect to* Abel, *and to his Offering*, Gen. 4. 4. First to *Abel*, and then to his Offering. *Non* Abel *ex muneribus, sed ex* Abel *munera placuerunt*; saith *Gregory*.

Reply.

1. I never doubted of the *acceptance* of our duties;

ties; but I am far from thinking yet, that *Acceptance* is properly *justifying*.

2. I shall in reply to your next Section, recant part of this; but not to your mind.

3. I am not now of your opinion (if generally understood of *all works* or duties) that God *first accepteth* our *persons*, and then our *works*. 1. If you mean by [*Accepting our persons,*] *election* of them to *Acceptance and Life*, I confess it is Antecedent, but not causal of the Acceptance of our duties. 2. The like I yield of his Philanthropy, if that be called [*Accepting our persons.*] 3. But if you mean (as doubtless you do) the accepting our persons as Members of Christ, and reconciled to him, and so the lawful Objects of his special Love, I deny your Assertion; and I affirm, That the *Act and Habit of Faith* are *accepted of God*, in *order of Nature*, before *our persons* are so *accepted:* 1. For Faith is the *Condition* of that *Acceptance* of our persons; and I know, I need not prove to you, that the *Condition* and its Acceptance, go before the benefit given on that Condition. The *Acceptance of our persons*, is the same as *Reconciliation*, *Justification*, *Adoption* in effect: For it is God's accepting us, as reconciled, justified, adopted ones. And is not the *Acceptance* of *Faith*, yea, and Knowledg, Repentance, before these? The Question is in effect the same with that which we commonly debate with the Antinomians, Whether we are reconciled, justified, adopted, before we repent and believe? 2. The contrary opinion makes God an Accepter of persons, in the sense that is so oft disclaimed by him in Scripture.

If any ask, *How can he accept the faith of a person not accepted, and unreconciled?*

I answer, For his Christ, his Covenant and Promise sake; and also, that Faith is the work of his Spirit, bringing the person into an acceptable state: And this leads me to a third Concession.

4. I yield that there is such a preparation to our acceptance made in the Satisfaction of Christ, as paid to God and accepted, that (the great impediments being removed) all men may be said, to be conditionally accepted before they believe: God is so far reconciled to Mankind in general, that he treats with them on new-terms, and offers them actual Peace and Acceptance on very reasonable Conditions, consistent with the freeness of his gift.

5. And I grant you also, that our persons must be justified and reconciled, before our *external obedience* can be accepted, such as *Abel*'s Sacrifice was; but not before our *Faith*, *Repentance*, and *Love* can be accepted. The general effect of Christ's Death, extendeth so far, as to procure Acceptance of our *Faith*, (in order of nature, but not of time) before the Acceptance of our *persons*, by special Reconciliation. I like not therefore *Gregories* phrase, though his sense be good: I should say, *Nec* Abel *ex muneribus*, *nec ex* Abel *munera*, *sed ex Christo & fœdere Gratiæ*, *&* Abel *& munera placuerunt.*

But by the way (from your instance) take notice, that it was not as they were an imperfect Conformity to the Law of Works, that *Abel*'s Works were accepted; for the Text expresly saith, It was *by Faith* that Abel *offered a more excellent Sacrifice than* Cain; *by which he obtained witness that he was righteous*, *God testifying of his gifts*, Heb. 11.4.

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Page 135. *IT is improper in the best sense; because it is contrary to the Scripture-use of the word* [Justifying] *which is the acquitting of us from the Charge of breaking the Law, and not from the Charge of violating the New-Covenant.*

Animadverf.

Justifying, as the Scripture doth use the Word, is the acquitting of us from all sin. *For he is justified, to whom the Lord doth not impute sin*, Rom. 4. 8. *Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's Elect?* (*viz.* when they are justified?) *'tis God that justifieth*, Rom. 8. 33. *Now all sin is a breaking of the Law*, 1 John 3. 4. Your selves say, *p.* 147. [There's no sin prohibited in the Gospel, which is not a breach of some one Precept in the Decalogue.] But what all this which you here say, is to your purpose; *viz.* To prove that the forementioned saying of Divines is improper, I confess I cannot well see. For though (as you say) Justifying in Scripture is the acquitting of us from the Charges of breaking the Law, and not from the Charge of violating the New-Covenant, may it not yet properly be said, that Christ first justifieth our persons, and then our duties and actions? You hold, that the New-Covenant is not violated but by *final Unbelief*; and I suppose it to be true, if it be rightly understood. But for any thing I can see, though none be acquitted from such Violation of the New-Covenant, yet first our persons, and then our duties and actions may properly be said to be justified; that is, accepted as just, and acquitted from all Accusation brought against them, though in themselves they be not such, but that sin doth cleave unto them.

Reply.

1. I must first tell you, that I do recant these words, and the following Reasons of them, as all weak. I think it not improper to say, *God in judgment will justifie our Faith from the Accusation of unsoundness, and our obedience too.* And I think *James* and other places use the word *Justifying* to such a sense; *viz.*

against

against the Accusation that we are Unbelievers or Hypocrites, and so no performers of the Condition of the New-Covenant. And I think most Christians are more solicitous, how to answer that Accusation in Judgment (and good reason) than the Accusation of their being *sinners*, and deserving God's wrath for that in general. And the *esteeming* a *righteous action* to be *righteous*, may imply *Accusability*; and the *sentencing* it Righteous, implieth *Accusation*. And the *person* cannot be accused, but by accusing his *actions*. So much against my self.

2. Yet I maintain still the dangerousness of this speech, that our *Actions* are justified (through Christ's merits) by the Law of Works, or from the Accusation of sinfulness; and I stand to the Reasons thereof.

Now to your words: 1. And first I like not your equivocal definition of Justification, [*the acquitting of us from all sin:*] For it seems to imply, that God esteemeth us not sinners, but freeth us *à Reatu culpæ qua talis*: which is impossible. But I confess he acquitteth us from all sin, as it induceth an Obligation to punishment (as *Gataker* in the fore-cited words distinguisheth.) 2. But remember once more, that God hath made two distinct Covenants or Laws, and that each Law hath his proper Obligation; or else it is no Law: And that to acquit us from the Obligation of the Old-Law, is one Justification, consisting in Remission of sin; and the acquitting us from the Obligation of the New-Law, is not by dissolving it, and pardoning it, which is never done, but by justifying us against the Accusation of being so obliged: And this is another Justification. Pardon my so oft repeating the same thing.

3. When

3. When you say, [*Justifying is the acquitting from all sin.*] If by [*Acquitting,*] you mean [*Pardoning,*] then you must extend it only to all sin against the Law of Works, except that excepted by the Law of Grace; or all sin which Believers were guilty of, but not *all species* of sin. Not the sin against the Holy Ghost, not the final *non*-performance of the Conditions of the New-Covenant, which leave no remedy.

4. I am glad of your Concession, that the Covenant is not violated, but by final unbelief.

5. But I am heartily sorry that you think our *actions* as well as our *persons* are accepted as just, and acquitted from all Accusation brought against them (and that as to the Law of Works) though in themselves they be not such, but that sin doth cleave unto them (as you say.) Against this Doctrine I intended that Thesis; and I confess my heart detesteth it. I will bring an Accusation against my own actions and yours (our Prayers, Alms, *&c.*) viz. *They are sinful*, they are breaches of God's Law. How will you be justified from this Accusation? You will not plead, *Not-guilty* I hope, and say, *You do not sin!* You will say, God doth accept your actions as just. But how? Doth he take them really to be *not sinful?* and call *evil, good?* and say, *sin is no sin?* God forbid we should think it. Doth he make the *factum* to be *infectum*; or the word spoken to be unsaid again? *Absit. Nam sicut quicquid est, necessario est, dum est: ita quicquid fuit, vel præteritum est, necessariò fuit.* The Language of Divines is, it cannot be undone *ne per divinam potentiam.*

See all that I would say in this fully in *Amesii Medul.* l. 1. c. 27. §. 20, & 21.

tentiam: But is it *morally undone?* How? As I said, God doth not esteem it [*not to have been done,*] much less [*not to have been ill done*:] And as *quod fuit, necessario fuit (necessitate existentiæ, ut aiunt:) ita quod malè fuit, necessario malè fuit:* The *Reatus culpæ* therefore cannot possibly be removed or remitted; that is, the man cannot be, or justly esteemed to be, a man that [*sinned not.*] But only the *Reatus pœnæ* is taken away: God so forgiveth all our sin, that as they induce the *Debitum pœnæ*, he destroyeth them; and by dissolving the Obligation, freeth us as much from the effects (Eternal Wrath) as if they had never been committed. Is not this enough? But how you will be free from all Accusation of being a sinner, I know not.

2. Do you not fully hereby set up *Justification by the Works of the Law?* For if all your works can be justified from the Accusation of being *sinful*, or breaches of the Law, then why may not the Law justifie you (were it not only for Original sin (or perhaps you will except your sins before Conversion.)

3. Is not this the way that the Papists go? though they will not plead for Merits without Christ, yet they think that Christ hath merited the Meritoriousness of their works. So you think that Christ hath merited, that your works shall be justified from the Accusation of sinfulness.

4. And I will bring this Accusation against your works, from the Law of Works: They are not so far meritorious of Everlasting Life, as that Law requires they should be. How will you acquit them from that Accusation? Do you think Christ hath made them so meritorious.

5. Yea

5. Yea further, I will bring this Accusation against your works. They are such as deserve Eternal Damnation; yea, and for them you are obliged thereto, immediately upon the doing of them. How will you answer this Accusation? I hope not by denying it. For if you are not first *obligatus ad pœnam*, you are not capable of *Remission*. For *Remission* is nothing else but the dissolving of that Obligation. And indeed, I know nothing else that I have to say against that Accusation, but (confessing the *desert*, and that I was so obliged) to plead, that *For Christ's Satisfaction the Obligation is dissolved, by the Grant of the New-Covenant*, ut per Legem rediantem.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *Justification doth imply Accusation; but the esteeming a righteous action to be as it is, doth not imply Accusation.*

Animadver.

You might also as well say, The esteeming of a righteous person to be as he is: But neither our persons nor our actions are so righteous, but that we may be accused of, and condemned for sin in them, and so without the mercy of God in Christ must be. *There's not a just man upon earth, that doth good and sinneth not.* Eccles. 7. 20. *If we say that we have no sin, we deceive our selves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, God is faithful and just to forgive us*, &c. 1 John 1. 8, 9. *If God shall contend with us, we cannot answer him one of a thousand*, Job 9. 3. *Aaron* was *to bear the iniquity of the holy things, which the children of Israel did hallow in all their holy gifts*, Exod. 28. 38. So that even in our holy things there is iniquity, which Christ the true High-Priest doth bear, that so it may not be imputed to us.

Reply.

This speech I have already reversed; and therefore will say no more about it.

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Ibid. IF *it be understood in the worst sense, it will overthrow the Righteousness of Christ imputed*, &c.

Animadvers.

But not if it be understood, as I suppose it should be, That through Christ the imperfection and iniquity of our actions (though otherwise holy) is covered, and not imputed to us. This doth not overthrow, but establish Christ's Righteousness.

Reply.

Because this is but to assert the Remission of sin; and Remission is nothing but the remitting the Obligation to punishment: But if you think that the sin is remitted, or not imputed *absolutè ut peccatum*, as well as *respectivè. quoad pœnam*; and that your actions may be justified against all Accusations, then I know not how the hard consequences forementioned will be avoided.

Aphorism.

Page 136. IF *God do justifie our works from any Legal Accusation (as he doth our persons) then it will follow that our works are just, and consequently that we are justified by them.*

Animadvers.

This I grant would follow, if God did justifie our works for their own sake, as being fully and perfectly righteous; but not if he do it (as he doth) for Christ's sake, pardoning and passing by the imperfection that is in them. That which hence doth follow, is not that our works are just; (*viz.* fully and perfectly as they must be, that we may be justified by them) but that they through Christ are accepted as such; not that we are justified by our works, but that we are justified, notwithstanding the iniquity that is in them. And it seems strange unto me, how you should infer from that saying of some Divines, that we

we are justified by our works, when as the very saying it self is this, That first our persons are justified, and then our works: So that it should rather follow, That our works are justified by us, than that we are justified by our works; though indeed neither doth follow, but that both we and our works are justified by Christ, though first we, and then our works; all which (as I have shewed) is agreeable to the Scriptures.

Reply.

1. It will follow indeed, that our persons were first justified by Christ, but that afterward they may be justified by our works, when once our works themselves are all justified. You may find full Answers to this in *Chamier*, *Paræus*, *Amesius* and the rest, against the foresaid Doctrine of [Meritoriousness of Works merited by Christ.]

2. And you should have told us, Whether it be all our works that are thus justified, or but some. If all, then our sins are justified (as *David*'s Adultery, &c.) which I think you will not say. If some (as our Duties) then the justifying is nothing but the pardoning of their sinfulness: Which pardon supposeth them sinful, and it is to the *person* that the pardon is given, and not to the *work*; and the pardon only destroyeth the obligation to Punishment (commonly called Guilt) and not the evil of the work.

Aphorism.

Page 138. *IF there be any sins against the New-Covenant, which are not also against the Old; or if any sins be considered in any of their respects, as against the Gospel only, &c.*

Anim.

Animadverſ.

I ſee not how final Unbelief, or any ſin whatſoever, can be againſt the Goſpel only, and not alſo againſt the Law; ſin, as ſin, being a tranſgreſſion of the Law, 1 *John* 3.4. And there being no ſin prohibited in the Goſpel, which is not a breach of ſome Precept in the Decalogue, as your ſelf confeſſes, *p.* 147.

Reply.

1. You do not put a right name on my Aſſertion, to call it [*my Confeſſion*] unleſs you had accuſed me with contradicting it (which methinks you ſhould not.)

2. Though you be of my judgment in this, yet others are not.

3. I know ſin is a tranſgreſſion of the Law; but our Queſtion is, Of what Law? Old or New? and how far?

4. It is not ſo eaſie a matter to conceive ſuddenly how unbelief and neglect of Sacraments, *&c.* are ſins againſt the Law of Works, or the Precepts of the Decalogue, as belonging to that Law. 1. As to the Decalogue and preceptive part of the Law of Works, as it is merely in *nature*, and was delivered at the firſt, I conceive it doth command *obedience* in *general*, and ſpecifie all *natural duties*, and ſo forbid the *contrary* ſin: But it doth not *ſpecifie each particular duties* that *after* were added. I conceive that the Law of Nature, or Works, doth leave room after the firſt Inſtitution, for the adding of new-*poſitives*, without making a new-*form* of the Law as to the *Sanction*. Elſe every poſitive that *Moſes* added, ſhould have made a New-Law: So of *ſacrificing before* Moſes, *&c.* the ſence of the Law was, [Obey God in all that he now doth, or hereafter ſhall command;] and Nature ſpeaks ſo plainly. And when-ever the *Poſitive-Command* is added

added in any age, it is a fresh discovery of God's will, which *Nature* obligeth us to obey: The Obligation is as much from the *general Precept* in *Nature*, as from the *particular* superadded: And though the *general Precept*, [*Obey all God's Will*,] could not oblige to the particular till it was in being; yet when it is in being it doth oblige even to that particular, *mediante Revelatione*, which enableth us to assume, [but this is God's Will.] The same I say of the *Sanction* of the Law of Nature: It threatneth Death to *all sin*, even against a Command that was not at the first Institution in being. It saith, [Whosoever sinneth shall die.] So that it is evident that the Law of Nature in its general Precept, extendeth to all particulars that hereafter shall be revealed to be God's Will. But because I said in my Aphoris. [*That as Faith is to such an end required, so it is not specially commanded by the Law of Works.*] I must partly explain, and partly recant that. For now I think that all duties, with all their ends, are required by the Law of Nature, or that Law obligeth to them; and so to Faith, as it is a means of Remission, though this seemed strange to me heretofore. But here you must distinguish still, 1. Between the Precept, as it is a Precept, and maketh duty; and the Institution of that duty to be the *Condition* of Life. 2. Between these two Notions, [*The Law of Nature*,] and [*The Law of Works*;] for it is called, [*The Law of Works*,] in reference to the *Sanction*, as Works are made the *Condition* of Life or Death: But it is not called, The Law of Works, when you consider the *Precept* alone, though it command perfection. 3. You must distinguish between the Law of Natures obliging Man in In-

nocency, and the same Law as continued, obliging man faln; and also obliging man redeemed, and in hopes of Pardon and Life restored. The change of mans state may cause the same Law to oblige him to new-duties. 4. You must distinguish between [The preparing and giving Christ, Grace, Hope, &c. and revealing them to Mankind in the Gospel,] and, [The obliging hereupon to the duty of Believing and Receiving them.] And so I conclude thus for the Solution.

1. That (as is said) the *Law of Nature* binding us to *Do all that God shall make known to be his Will*, doth oblige us to each *particular*, when it is *made known*, as it doth *generally* oblige to *obedience* before. And so it obligeth even to *Faith*, *Repentance*, &c.

2. The Law of Nature doth *not reveal* Christ, or Grace and Pardon, and Life by him; nor did it make the preparation, by giving Christ to satisfie for sin. This is proper to the Law of Grace, to publish Grace and Christ.

3. The Law of Nature doth not make man any promise of Pardon, Justification and Salvation, if he repent and believe.

4. The Law of Nature did not oblige man in Innocency to repent, or return to God, or believe in Christ. For there was not the matter of, or capacity in us, for such an Obligation.

5. But as soon as ever Man was faln, (even before Christ was promised) the Law of Nature obliged faln Man to *repent* and *return* to God. But it gave him no hope of pardon on his Repentance: So that it would have been but a despairing Repentance. Yet hereby it is apparent, that the Law of Nature maketh us *new-duties*, as our case changeth;

and

and some duties proper to *faln Man*, which to the *Innocent* it made not.

6. Though the Law of Nature neither *give* nor *reveal* Christ, Hope, Pardon, and restored Life, yet when God by Grace hath redeemed us, and given us up to Christ, and revealed Him, and Hope, and Life by him, then the Law of Nature commandeth us to believe God's Revelation, and accept God's gracious offer, and repent and return, and love him that bought us, and be thankful, *&c.* Who feeleth not in himself, that Nature and common Reason obligeth to, or requireth this on the foresaid suppositions? So much of the Precept of Natures Law.

7. The Law of Nature continueth to pronounce Death due to every sin, and the greatest punishment due to the greatest sins. And therefore by that Law, Death is due to Unbelief; yea, a far sorer punishment than was due to ordinary sins, in that it hath such aggravations. And though it condemned Man for the first sin, and provided him no remedy, yet a remedy being *aliunde* provided, it further condemneth him if he reject it.

8. Though the form of the Law of Works was not altered by God; yet the Obligation (as it were) of the *promissory* or *premiant* part is ceased, upon Man's first sin, through the utter incapacity of Man to receive it. For it promised Life only to the perfect or *innocent*; and the first sin made us all *nocent*, and unmeet subjects. And so Divines use to say, That the Law as *a Covenant* is dissolved; not that the *whole Sanction* is dissolved, but *per cessationem*, the promissory part is void, or the Promiser disobliged by us.

9. That therefore which is proper to the New-Law is, that it, 1. Be built on a new foundation, *viz.* Redemption; and so the Legislator is *Deus-Redemptor*, and not only *Deus-Naturæ*, *vel Deus-Creator* as such. 2. That it reveal Christ, and his Sacrifice, and Hope, Pardon and Life, *&c.* 3. That it promise and give all these. 4. That it *institute the Condition* on which they shall be given, or be ours. All these the Law of Nature meddleth not in; though when the *Condition* is instituted, it obligeth us not only in general to obey, but in special to obey, and use it to these ends appointed.

10. Yet no man must think, that *all* the *New-Law* consisteth in these only, and that the *Precept* and *Threatning* are no true parts of the New-Law, because they are common with the Old: For even these are still true parts of it. Even as the earth that man's body was made of, ceased not to be truly earth when it was made man, nor ceaseth to be a proper or essential part of man, because it is earth. Or as a cup of water taken out of the River, and made Beer, ceaseth not to be water, nor yet can be denied to be Beer. Only it ceaseth to be mere or common water, as our bodies do to be mere common earth. So here the preceptive part of the Law of Nature, is comprehensive of the Law of Grace, and all Laws that ever will be (supposing those alterations *in rerum Natura* which lay the grounds:) But yet, as the Specification of the Covenants or Laws, is (as *Camero* oft, and others) from the *Condition* and *Sanction*, and so the New-Law is specified from thence: So it hence assumeth into its nature, even that which is part of the Law of Natur. Only as man's body is now no *common earth*,

so

so the Precepts of *Faith*, *Repentance*, &c. as tending to recovery, are not *common Legal Precepts*; But may be considered as belonging to the Law of Grace, and also to the Law of Nature. So that as man's Soul is specifically distinct from earth, and his Body in it self not so, but as *pars à toto*; but yet is made an essential part of man: So the *preceptive* part of the Law of Grace, is distinct from the Law of Nature, but as *pars à toto*; and yet is made an essential part of that Law, whose *Promise* and Institution of a *Condition qua talis*, is *specifically* distinct from the Law of Nature; and from the whole is denominated as specifically distinct.

And hence it is that the Law of Christ is oftner called, a *Testament*, *Covenant*, *Gospel*, &c. than a Law: Which hath occasioned the *Lutheran* Divines (some of them) against Scripture, and all Antiquity, to deny it to be properly a Law, and confine its whole nature to the foresaid *proper parts*, which *in specie* differ from the Old. It must be known, that as the Righteousness of Faith (in it self, as the Condition of the New-Law) is but *subservient* to *Christ's Righteousness*, and required for it; so the *New-Law* is a *subservient Law* to the *Law of Nature*, being but *Lex remedians*, to destroy the Obligation of the Old *(ad pœnam)* and conduce to the attaining of its ends.

And so much for explication of my thoughts on this point; which I write to satisfie my self as I go on in reviewing my Writings. I think the right stating, and clear apprehension of this point (of the difference between the Law and Gospel, and how far the Law of Works is abrogated) to be of greater moment and difficulty by far, than your

Animadversions take notice of; or than any thing (as to difficulty) that you deal with, as far as I remember.

The sum of all is, That the *promissory* part of the *Law of Works* doth not oblige, but is destroyed, not by an *Abrogation*, but *Cessation*, *cessante materia vel capacitate subjecti*: But the *Precept* ceaseth not (except some Positives, which may be added or taken away without alteration in the nature of the Law;) nor the *Threatning* (because *nec abrogatur, nec cessat materia*:) That the *Precept* of the Law of Grace is now under the general Precept of the Law of Nature. Yet is it not fit to call Faith and Repentance, and Sacraments, &c. [*Precepts of the Law of Nature*,] without Explication; because they have now a *super*-added new-form, by conjunction with the Doctrine and Promise of Grace (as the water hath a new-form by commixtion, when it is made Beer; and the Body of man, when of earth it was made man, and yet retaineth the form of water, and earth still: But the denomination must follow the new *super*-added form.) And so the Denomination of Faith and Repentance must be from the *super*-added form, and they must be called, [*Parts of the New-Law.*] Yet the whole bulk of the Precepts of the Law of Nature, remain in conjunction with the Threatnings of that Law: But the Promise of the New-Law is a remedy at hand to dissolve it. And the Threat of the New-Law hath in it somewhat common to it with the Old; (*viz.* The Institution of the dueness of Punishment to Impenitency and Unbelief, proportioned to their nature) and something proper to the New-Law; *viz.* In the Negative, not to institute the penalty due to each

each particular sin; Positively, to make its Obligation to Punishment for final Unbelief and Impenitency, to be remediless, and irreversible, and peremptory, determining not only *de Debito* (as the first Law doth, and all Laws do;) but also by Prediction *de Eventu* which is a thing *super*-added to the *strict* nature of a Law as such. Besides, that it incorporateth the common part of the Threat also into its own body, and maketh it essential to it self; *viz.* the *Debitum non-liberationis, & majoris pœnæ.*

Aphorism.

Ibid. *FOr to all that Unbelief, and other sins of the godly which are forgiven, the Gospel doth no where threaten death.*

Animadverf.

Not so indeed threaten death, as not withal to offer life upon Condition of repenting and believing: Which also the Gospel doth even to the ungodly, *Acts* 3. 19. & 13. 38,39. But the Gospel establishing, and not repealing the Moral Law (as you confess, *pag.* 154.) doth threaten death to all Unbelief, and to all sin, that so the Grace and Mercy offered to men in the Gospel, may be accepted of them.

Reply.

The [Moral Law] is usually taken for the mere Preceptive part of the Law of Nature, as absolutely considered without the Sanction: And so the same thing which is the Law of Nature, may be also the directive or preceptive part of the Law of Grace: (Though I am unsatisfied, whether it be fit to say, The Law of Christ doth constitute that duty a-new, and take in the Moral Law as part of it self; or only suppose it, and make use of it.) But you

here take the [Moral Law] for the Precept, as conjunct with the Threatning (else you would not say, it threateneth death:) But so I take it to be no true part of the New Law, though not dissolved or abrogated by it. Else I think we shall make the first Law of Nature, and Christ's Law of Grace all one.

Aphorism.

Page 163. *But the Covenant-Conditions are not broken, when-ever the Precept of the Gospel is transgressed, or the Covenant neglected, except it be final.*

Animadvers.

This seems more acute than solid. For may not the Conditions of the Covenant be broken, though they be not finally broken? The Conditions of the New-Covenant are, to repent and believe. Now if they to whom the New-Covenant is tendered, be impenitent and unbelieving; so long as they are so, they break the Conditions of the New-Covenant, whether it be only for a time, or to the end. Indeed if the Covenant-Conditions be at length performed, they are not absolutely broken; but yet broken they are, whilst they are not performed, and yet ought to be performed. The New-Covenant you grant, may be neglected; but it is not neglected, if the Conditions of it be performed: And to distinguish between not-performing the Conditions of the Covenant, when it is tendered, and breaking the Conditions of it; I think is not sound.

Reply.

1. You seem (by your silence) to grant the main thing I here intend; viz. *Thes.* 33. That *Christ died not to satisfie for the Violation of the Covenant of Grace, but of Works only.*

2. I did explain what I meant by [*Violating the Conditions,*] in the last words of the *Thesis*, [*So as that the offender should fall under the Threat*]: But more fully in the Appendix.

3. By

3. By [*the Threatning*,] I mean not [*every discovery of an imminent danger*;] but that proper act of the Law, which is *obligare ad pœnam*.

4. I still confess, that for *Unbelief* and *Impenitency*, men remain *obligati ad pœnam per Legem naturæ*, till they believe, and so that Obligation be dissolved.

5. But still I deny it, as to the proper Obligation of the New-Law: For I conceive that is peremptory, remediless and undissolvable. And therefore I think it both sound and necessary to distinguish between the proper *Violation* of the Covenant, and the *temporary non-performance* of the Conditions. Yet I resolve not to contend about the *Word* or *Name:* If you think the one is as *properly* to be called a *Violation* as the other, and I think not, this is a matter of no great moment. But as to the thing intended by that word, I say, that *Unbelief not final*, is *no such Violation* of the New-Law, as to make us *obligati ad pœnam hujus Legis propriam*, or that *this Law* should oblige us to punishment. For else we must say, that Christ came to satisfie his own Law, and be a Mediator between himself, as Mediator, and sinners, which I am loth to say. Indeed the Gospel-Covenant doth *non-liberare*, while men continue their unbelief. But I conceive it doth not *obligare ad pœnam proprie, viz. ad non-liberationem & ad pœnam majorem*, but for final *non*-performance. For if it do, it is either *absolutely*, or *conditionally*: Not *absolutely* (which you here confess;) for then there were *no remedy*: For the *absolute Threat* of the New-Law is *irrevocable* and *remediless*. And if but *conditionally*, then it is no Obligation: For it were no Condition, if it suspend not the Act of the Law. If a King say to a company of imprisoned Murtherers,

therers, He that will promise a new-life shall be pardoned; and he that will not, shall not be pardoned, but at the Assizes suffer a double torment. Here the Condition of present Liberation indeed is present, promising amendment; and for want of present promising, he shall want present Liberation. But the Condition of Liberation or Condemnation at the Assizes, is promising any time between this and then. And so here: The Gospel doth not *remediare*, *dissolve* the Laws Obligation, as long as we continue impenitent. But it obligeth us not to Condemnation at Judgment, but upon final Unbelief. If yet any say, that this present *non-Liberation* is *pœna novæ Legis*, and so far it may be said *obligare*: Though I should rather say, it doth *non dissolvere obligationem*, yet I shall confess, that this *non-Liberation* may in some sort be called *pœna*, and I will not stick at this. Only remember that this is nothing to the Obligation, to *sentential Condemnation de futuro*, which we speak of. 2. And that Christ need not die for this: For this *non-liberatio dum non credo*, is a penalty that I bear my self (*non enim liberor*;) and therefore Christ need not bear it for me.

But I come so lately from a fuller handling this point with another, that I must say no more of it now.

Aphorism.

Page 164. THe *Condition is, Whosoever believeth shall be saved, not limiting it to a particular season.*

Anim.

Animadverſ.

It's true: He only ſhall be damned as a Tranſgreſſor of the New-Covenant, who is a final Unbeliever; yet all the time that any refuſe to believe, they are liable to Damnation, as tranſgreſſing all that time the New-Covenant, and breaking the Condition of it.

Reply.

If by [*Lyable*,] you mean [*actually obliged to Damnation*,] I deny it. If you mean, they are in *danger* of it, becauſe God may cut them off when he will; or that ſuppoſing their Unbelief to be final, they would be obliged; or that there wants nothing but the finality to oblige them; or that they are obliged even for that ſin, to death *per Legem naturæ*, and are *non liberati per Legem gratiæ*, I grant all this.

Aphoriſm.

Page 165. *BEcauſe the puniſhment which naturally and implicitely is due to them, is not ſo much as threatned in this gentle Covenant*, &c.

Animadverſ.

Perhaps this place is miſ-printed: Otherwiſe I do not ſee how theſe words make for the proof of that which went before; *viz.* [The ſins of Believers againſt the Goſpel-Precepts have need of pardon, and are properly ſaid to be pardoned, in reference to their deſerved puniſhment.] Is Puniſhment therefore deſerved, becauſe it is not threatened? Or do you mean (as perhaps you do) by thoſe words, [which is naturally and implicitely due to them,] that Puniſhment is deſerved, but not threatned? But if Puniſhment be not threatned, there ſeems no need of pardon. Becauſe what need is there to fear that which is not threatned? As what ground is there to hope for that which is not promiſed? Somewhere before your ſelf ſays, What God doth not threaten, we need not fear.

Reply.

Reply.

The miſ-printing is, that there ſhould have been a Parentheſis to encloſe ſix lines, from [1. *Both.*] till [*becauſe* :] And ſo the word [*Properly*] I intended only to joyn with the ſecond Section; and intended the firſt as *improperly*, called Pardon, arguing, not as you ſuppoſe, [It is not threatned, therefore not deſerved;] but thus, [*It was threatened by the Old-Law*, and is *not ſo much as threatned* by *the New*; therefore *it may improperly* be *ſaid to be remitted.*]

Aphoriſm.

Page 173. *ACts have not the reſpect of an Adjunct to its Subject, but of an Effect to its Cauſe.*

Animadverſ.

Every Act is an accident, and therefore muſt have a ſubject; for it cannot ſubſiſt by it ſelf. And whereas tranſient Acts are ſubjected in the Patient, immanent Acts are ſubjected in the Agent, becauſe here the Agent is alſo the Patient.

Reply.

Becauſe I will not vainly enter into a Logical Diſpute with you, I will only anſwer you in the words of *Schibler*, *Metaphyſ.* l. 2. c. 10. *Art.* 4. *Tom.* 3. *punct.* 1, 2. §. 51. 54, 55. *Accidens eſt in alio loquendo per* κατάχρησιν. *Omne ſcil. accidens eſt in alio ſenſu negativo quatenus non habet eſſe* ἀυθοπόστατον, *ſive per ſe ſubſiſtens. Alias autem loquendo de generalia eſſentia accidentis, non eſt ea inhærendo, ſi rigoroſe loquamur; ſed in eo, quod id quod accidens eſt, afficit ſubſtantiam extra-eſſentialiter, ſive extra eſſentiam, aut rationem ejus exiſtendo, &c. vid. ultra.* Et *n.* 54. *Quod ad actionem immanentem attinet, dicitur immanens ab immanendo quia in agente maneat.*

Exiſtimo

Existimo tamen eam non esse intelligendam positivè sed negativè. Nempè actio immanens qua talis est in agente hoc sensu, quia non transit ad patiens. In ipso autem agente non est per modum adjuncti, sed simpliciter ad ipsum comparatur ut ad causam. Unde hæc propositio, homo intelligit vel disputat, non est ut adjuncti de subjecto, sed ut effecti de causa: Et patet. Nam actio transiens nullum habet subjectum, ne quidem ipsum patiens, ut visum est: ergo etiam actio Immanens à fortiori non postulat subjectum. Consequentia firma est: quia actio transiens magis est ex subjecto, & magis postulat subjectum, quam actio immanens. Sed actio transiens in esse actionis nullum habet subjectum ut visum est, ergo idem à fortiore est in actione immanente. Et confirmatur, quod actio ut sic, non dicit nisi egressum à virtute activa alicujus agentis. Egressus autem opponitur τῷ esse in. Et hinc relinquitur, generatim loquendo de actione ut sic, eam non postulare subjectum, &c. I think it fitter to say, *Actio est agentis*, than *Actio est in agente*. Yet I confess my self in doubt about *Scotus* Doctrine, that [*Immanent Acts in their perfection, are not in the predicament of Action, but of Quality*:] And if that be so, you may well say they are *in Agente ut subjecto*.

Aphorism.

Page 174. *But grant that all God's immanent Acts are eternal (which I think is quite beyond our understanding to know,)* &c.

Anim.

Animadverſ.

Immanent acts (as that very word it ſelf doth ſhew) abiding in the agent (for therefore they are called immanent.) Either God's immanent Acts muſt be eternal, or there muſt be ſomething in God which is but temporal: Whereas *quicquid eſt in Deo eſt Deus*: otherwiſe he ſhould not be a moſt pure and ſimple Eſſence, as he is.

Reply.

I uſe to ſpeak as you do; and thus oppoſe thoſe that think otherwiſe: But let me profeſs, it is but my *Opinion*, and not my *Faith*. I have no ſuch clear knowledg of the Divine Eſſence, as peremptorily to conclude theſe things as certain. I know God is eternal, and that he is perfect: But whether his perfection lye, in having no Acts, but his Eſſence; or whether God do *agere* at all; or whether his Acts have extrinſick objects; or whether thoſe Acts which have ſuch extrinſick objects, are properly immanent, as thoſe are whoſe object is God himſelf, *&c.* I dare not conclude as certain, though I think as you. Oh how little know I of God's Eſſence!

Aphoriſm.

Page 175. *Relations are but mere* entia Rationis.

Animadverſ.

Why then is Relation put among the Predicaments? Is there not a *real Relation* betwixt the Father and the Son? a Relation which hath its being in Nature, and not in mans intellect only?

Reply.

Reply.

I am so far from believing *all* the Predicaments to be *real Beings*, that I doubt whether *any two* of them wholly are so, as much as *Carpenter* did. Yet I take them to be as *Burgersdicius* speaks, *aliquid inter nihil & ens reale*: And I think that *Scotus* his *formalitates* or *modi*, and *ens rationis*, contain much that now commonly goes under another Name. I think the *subjectum & fundamentum Relationis*, is sometimes *quid reale* (usually, but *quid modale* is the *fundamentum.*) I think that the comparing or collating act of understanding is not a mere fiction, or false, when it makes Relation. But whether when the *Foundation* is laid, the Fabrication of the Essence of the Relation *ut sic*, be not by the Intellect, is my question. If *Peccatum* be but *ens rationis* (which is accounted a *real Relation* of Disconformity to the Rule) as is ordinarily said: And if *veritas* be but *ens rationis* (as *Durandus* saith) why may I not say so of others? Relation-terms are as properly ascribed to God, as any terms of Humane Language, I think. But was God from *Eternity* a *Creator?* If yea, then there was a Creature, or a Relation without a correlate. If no; then it begun in time. If so, then if it were any real Being (remember your last arguing) it must be God him-

Herebr. saith, *Quare inepte dicitur & falso, Relationes more accidentium caeterorum inesse subjectis, cum subjecto tantum modo attribuantur. Voces quippe Relativa non significant aliud, quod subjecto proprie ac per se inest, sed tantum declarant quomodo subjectum se habeat ad terminum*, &c. And he saith, That Relation is *Medium inter ens reale & nihil, non participationis sed negationis*: Of which there are also other sorts, *Disp. Phil. 5. page* 178, 184.

himself, and so eternal, or God not eternal. But I am resolved not to dispute this with you: Only that Relation is not *verè ens* (of which I am more confident, than what it is) save me the labour of transcribing, and read *Burgersdicius*, l. 1. c. 5. & c. 6. and *Hereboord*, *Disp. Phil.* 5. per tot. (I will not refer you to *Carpenter*) *vid. & quid de Relat. Rationis dicit Twissius Vind. Grat. l.* 2. *part.* 1. §. 13. *pag.* (*minor. volum.*) 208. *præcipue ex Vasquio.*

Aphorism.

Page 194. *That saying of our Divines, that* [Justification is perfected at first, and admits of no degrees,] *must be understood thus; That each of those Acts which we call Justification, are in their own kind perfect at once; and that our Righteousness is perfect, and admits of no degrees: But yet, as the former Acts called* [*Justification*] *do not fully and in all respects procure our freedom, so they may be said to be imperfect, and but degrees toward our full and perfect Justification at the last Judgment.*

Animadvers.

Properly none can be more or less justified, because he that is justified is freed from all Condemnation, *Rom.* 8. 1. & 33. Justification therefore at the last Judgment, is not a more full Justification, but only a Justification more fully made manifest. Neither do I see how you should deny, that our Justification here is perfect, so as to procure full and perfect freedom, *viz.* from Condemnation, if (as you grant) our Righteousness whereby we are justified be perfect: And so indeed it is, though that Righteousness be not (as you suppose) a Righteousness of our own within us, but only the Righteousness of Christ through faith imputed to us.

Reply.

Reply.

1. *Negatur sequela.* One man may be more perfectly freed from *all Condemnation* than another, though both be freed *from all.* It is not only the *Terminus à quo* that is to be considered, but the degree of the Liberation therefrom. One man may be freed from Condemnation only *quoad Donationem & Constitutionem Legis*, and another also *quoad sententiam judicis.*

2. Justification also freeth *against Accusation*, as the *means*, as well as *from Condemnation, the end*: And we are not yet freed against *all Accusation.*

3. And for the Antecedent, we must distinguish of the word [*freed from:*] either you mean, that our Liberation is *compleated* (which I deny;) or that it is so effectually begun, that it shall certainly be perfected (which serves not your turn.) The Apostle only saith, [*There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ:*] But as this Text doth not say, [*There shall be none,*] nor promise that they shall never be out of Christ again (though I think others do;) so it saith not that their deliverance from future Condemnation (or which would else be future) is perfected. They are not now under Condemnation, nor ever shall be; (Is not that all you can hence gather?) and yet they would be to morrow condemned, if no more were done than is done. I will be bold to tell you; how far short you are yet from Perfection, even in this matter of Justification.

1. There is a great deal of guilt which will lye on you, from which you are not yet justified *ne quidem constitutivè.* You *will sin* every day, hour and moment; Will you need no Justification from the guilt of these sins? They will condemn you, if

you have none. Perhaps a man may have the guilt of ten times more sins to be freed from after his first Justification, than before. If Justification be the same with *Remission of sin* (as very many say, and I know no real difference, as to *constitutive Justification*;) then sure you have need of a *particular Justification* upon the renewal of sin, as well as of a *particular Remission*, besides the *universal Justification* and *Remission* foregoing: Yea, though they be not the same, yet being so near akin, this will follow. I suppose you will not say, sin is *remitted before committed*; or guilt removed before it is guilt! If you fly to *Amese's*, [*Virtualiter & in subjecto,*] *Medul. l.* 1. *c.* 27. §. 24. that is sure less than *Actualiter & in se* (and indeed is not *Remission*;) and therefore not perfect.

2. Your Justification either is yet only *constitutive*, and not *per sententiam judicis*, or else only *quoad sententiam aliquam minus publicam*; *& non ab omnibus* (*scil. futuris*) *peccatis*: Whereas your Justification will be *per sententiam judicis*, at that great day, and that from all sin. How could the Apostle say, [*That your sins may be blotted out, when the time of refreshing comes*, &c. Acts 3. 19.] if no more be done then to it than now?

3. Our present Justification freeth us not from God's *Paternal Sentence*, *and castigatory punishment*; but our future Justification will.

4. The continuance of Justification while we are here, is but *conditional*, and *de futuro* neither *absolute* nor *actual*. And a *conditional* Justification is not so much as an absolute. That it is but *conditional*, is evident from the full tenor of the Covenant: It saith not, [*He that believeth once, shall be for*

for ever justified; but, [*He that believeth, is or shall be justified*;] that is, as long as he believeth.

If you say, [*It is certain they shall believe.*]

I answer, That altereth not the tenor of the Promise: Predestination giveth not Legal Right. It was *certain, vel futurum ab æterno*, that you should believe and persevere; and yet you were not therefore justified. And God only justifieth us *pro præsenti*, and not *pro futuro*. And then it is evident, that conditional Justification is not actual, nor true Justification: for *conditionale nihil ponit, donec præstetur conditio.* Where there is much means to be used, and conditions yet to be performed, for the Continuation and Consummation of our Justification, there it is not yet continued or consummate; nor that person so perfect as to Justification, as he that is past all conditions and means, and so hath his Justification consummate, and is in his immutable state. That much means is yet to be used to this end, that our Justification may be continued and consummate, and sentential Justification and Judgment added, if I thought I needed, I could easily and fully prove. Both Prayer, Obedience, *&c.* are means to that end: (of which more toward the end.) And that Conditions are yet to be performed to that end, I will argue on the common Principles (lest you deny Repentance or Obedience to be such Conditions.) If it be not only the first act of Faith by which men are justified, then their Justification is not so consummate at the first, but that they are still to be justified every day. But it is not only the first act of Faith by which men are justified; therefore, *&c.*

For the Antecedent; As it were a wild fancy to exclude all the Faith of a man's life, except the first

act; so *Abraham*'s example, as mentioned by the Apostle, contradicteth it expresly. And for the Consequence, If following acts of Faith justifie, either by concurring to our first Justification, or by the continuing our universal Justification, and procuring the daily addition of particular Justification and Remission: But it cannot be by concurring to our first Justification; for it is against Scripture and Reason, that I was justified twenty years ago, by believing to day. It is therefore by continuing our universal Justification, and procuring the addition of daily particular Justification: And all this by way of Condition. Now though Perseverance add nothing *ad rei naturam*, yet it is a moral Addition, which must have its Cause; and therefore such Promises are made to *Waiting*, *Patience*, *Perseverance*, &c. And that man that must have all these Conditions yet to perform, that he may be continuedly and consummately justified, is not in so perfect and full a sense justified, as he that hath done all. I still profess, that every sort or act of Justification is perfect in its kind, and as to its proper end; but not of the *perfectest kind*, nor absolutely perfect. He that is in the beginning of the fight, unwounded and safe, is as perfectly safe *quoad naturam rei*, as he that hath gone through all the rest of the dangers, and suffered twenty more particular charges, and overcome all: But he is not safe in so perfect a sense (though you suppose him by a spirit of Prophecy to be sure to scape;) because he hath yet much hazard and labour to go through for the attaining of his safety: And yet we may say as Paul, *'If these abide not in the ship, ye cannot be saved.* The end is not perfectly enjoyed, while so many

means

means are yet to be used for it. I refer you to Mr. *Burgess* of Justification, *Lect.* 29. which is wholly to prove the point I insist on.

5. There is yet the *solemnizing* of all wanting: And a Marriage not-solemnized is not all so perfect as that which is.

But the main thing that I stand on is, that both Christ's Apologetical Justification of us *qua Advocatus vel Patronus*, and his *sentential publick Justification* at Judgment, do not only differ from ours now; but so much differ, that I think we should scarce be called *justified now*, but in Relation to the Justification then.

But you think otherwise, that [*it is not a more full Justification, but a Justification more fully made manifest.*] Many men, many minds: I have sore contest with Mr. *L.* and all will not convince him, that *any but sentential* is properly *Justification*: And that which I call *Constitutive, & in sensu Legis*, is but *Right to Justification*. I easily yield to you, that the Law or Grant of Grace doth its own work perfectly, in *constitutive Justification*. But yet I make no doubt to affirm, that though Justification *constitutive* be *proper Justification*; yet the word is more commonly used by Lawyers and Protestant Divines, for *Justification by Sentence*: And so the Law justifieth but *virtually*, and not *properly* and *actually* at all (as to this *sentential Justification.*) To absolve from a Crime and Penalty, and *adjudicare præmium, contra actoris accusationem*, is the most full, perfect Justification of all. And it's exceeding strange, that you should think it nothing but a Justification made manifest, when it is another sort of Justification *toto cœlo*, different from *constitutive*:

Or if you mean, it is but a fuller Manifestation of some *sentential Justification*, which we have now by Faith; you should have said so, and should shew what *that Sentence* is, *& in quo foro? per quem judicem? & quinam sint actus judiciales? & cujus generis sit decisio absolutoria?* when I had brought that so far into question. But I conceive there is more in the *Sentence of the Judg*, than *Manifestation*. *Sententia Judicis est pars decisionis litis, quæ est causæ controversæ per judicem de terminatio*: Without it there is ordinarily no full *jus in re & possessio* of the Priviledge or Reward in question: It is more fully ours after the Judgment than before. Nor is there a perfect *Liberation* from the Crime and Penalty which we are charged to be guilty of: *Hæc enim pertinent ad sententiæ exècutionem, quæ sententiam ipsam præsupponit. Decretum est pars secunda judicii. Decernere est post causæ cognitionem statuere. Statuere est quid majus quam manifestare. Manifestant testes, evidentiæ, ipse reus, &c. Sed non statuunt, decernunt, nec per sententiam absolvunt.* That Adjudication of everlasting Reward or Punishment at the Judgment-day, will be more than mere Manifestation: It will be the most full, proper, perfect Justification which then we shall receive; which I think Scripture more respecteth in this point, than some observe; and I think it is in order to that great Justification that our present Justification obtains the name.

Again, I would argue thus: If Justification be opposed to Condemnation, and the Condemnation by publick Sentence be quite different in kind from Condemnation now *in Law* (or any sentential Condemnation that I know of) then Justification by

publick

publick Sentence, is as different from Justification in Law: But the former is true; therefore so is the latter. I say therefore as *Camero*, Prælect. de Verbo Dei, pag. 462. (operum fol.) [*Authoritas judicis propria jus facit; Itaq; judicis sententia effectiva potius est quam declarativa.*]

But suppose the Sentence did only *declare*: It may yet be as true and proper a kind of Justification as *constitutive*; if we consider, that it is not the Declaration of a private person, but of the Supreme Judg: And a *Declaration* in opposition to *Accusation (ne succedat)* and *Condemnation (ne sit;)* and which must determine the case finally, Whether we shall be in Heaven or Hell.

But you say, [*You see not how I can deny our Justification to be perfect, when I say our Righteousness is perfect.*]

I answer you by two necessary distinctions:

1. I deny not but our *constitutive Justification* is *perfect*; and that's all that can be gathered from the perfection of our Righteousness. But I deny that our *constitutive Justification* is the *most perfecting, compleat sort of Justification*; or yet that our *sentential Justification* is *now perfect*.

2. You must distinguish of *Perfection*, as it respecteth the *present subject*, and as the same thing *materially* is compared to *another subject*, or to the *future state* of that subject: And so I say, that we are *perfectly justified constitutive* the first day we believe, considering it as the *present Righteousness* of us in that present state: And yet that is not *materially* so perfect a Justification, as that which we have of the same kind at our death: For we are then justified from millions of sins more than be-

fore, and all the Conditions are performed. If therefore we had but the same Justification materially at death, which we had at our first believing, that is, were justified from no more sins, it would be no perfect Justification to us, but a partial and particular one. A Childs shooe is meet for his foot, and a mans is no more: But the same shooe which was meet for him when he was a Child, will not be meet when he is a man: Yea, if it be the skin on his foot, it must grow as he grows, or it will not be meet; and yet *Meetness* formally is one and the same thing. This is it that I told you before, that the matter of our Righteousness; *viz.* Our gracious inclinations and actions (commonly called Holiness) hath degrees, though Righteousness as such, hath none.

Aphorism.

Page 211. **IF** *we are not one real person with Christ, then one what?*

Animadverf.

The Apostle saith, *He that is joyned to the Lord, is one spirit*, 1 Cor. 6. 17. *i.e.* he is spiritually one with Christ, as being partaker of Christ's Spirit, and thereby united to him, and made one with him. And this I think you mean, when you say, that we are his Body Mystical, but not Natural.

Reply.

Unio hæc est spiritualis illa Relatio *hominum ad Christum qua jus acquirunt ad omnes illas benedictiones quæ in ipso præparantur.* Jo. 3. 12. & 3. 24. *Amesf. Medul.* l. 1. c. 26. §. 2.

This is mere Ambiguity, and no resolution of the Question. The Question is, Whether he that is spiritually one with him, or one Spirit with him, be one *Spirit essentially*, or *one personally*, *in sensu physico*; or only one person *in sensu morali vel politico*,

as

as a *Corporation* and their *Bailiff*, a *City* and their *Mayor*, a *Republick* and their *Sovereign*, are one Body? or, Whether Union be largely taken for Conjunction? But I am willing to let this Myſtery paſs with a reverend admiration and acknowledgment of my ignorance, rather than raſhly to determine in the dark: Only I reſolve to keep off from their errour, that tell us we are deified, or made one eſſence or perſon with Chriſt properly. I am afraid of ſoaring too high in proud aſpiring ſtrains, in my thoughts of our Union with Chriſt, and our participation of the Divine Nature; and leſt while I ſeek to be more than man, I become leſs; knowing that aſpiring to be as God, is the way to be a Devil. *Camero* in *Prælect.* hath ſaid more of this point of Union, than any I know; but he extendeth the ſenſe of [*Union*] ſomewhat far.

Aphoriſm.

Page 221. *BUt though Faith be not the Inſtrument of Juſtification, may it not be called, the Inſtrument of receiving Chriſt?*

Animadverſ.

I think they mean ſo, and no more, who call Faith the Inſtrument of our Juſtification, becauſe by Faith we receive Chriſt, by whom we are juſtified.

Reply.

I commend your charitable Interpretation: But the vehement aſſerting and arguing for Faiths proper, direct Inſtrumentality in juſtifying, which from multitudes I have heard, and which in multitudes I have read, forbiddeth me ſo to judg. And if it were ſo, their ſpeech is improper.

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Page 222. *The act of Faith (which is it that justifieth) is our actual receiving of Christ, and therefore cannot be the Instrument of receiving.*

Animadverſ.

1. The act of Faith doth juſtifie, not in reſpect of it ſelf as it is our act, though ſo it be requiſite, but in reſpect of its *Object*, *viz.* Chriſt; whom Faith acting, doth receive, even as it is the gift that doth enrich, though not except it be received.

2. The act of the hand is the actual receiving a gift; Is not the hand therefore the Inſtrument whereby the gift is received? and conſequently whereby one is eriched?

Yet I ſhall not be unwilling to yield unto you, that to ſpeak exactly, Faith may better be called a Condition, than an Inſtrument of our Juſtification. But becauſe it is as a hand to receive Chriſt (for to receive him, and to believe in him are the ſame, *John* 1. 12.) and the hand is ὄργανον ὀργάνων, a prime Inſtrument: therefore (I conceive it is) that Faith is uſually called an Inſtrument. Beſides, your ſelf obſerves, *page* 221. that ſome ſo extend the uſe of the word [*Inſtrument*,] as that any thing almoſt may be called an Inſtrument, *viz.* which is requiſite, but yet is leſs principal in the action.

Reply.

1. We are not juſtified by the act of Faith abſolutely, or as the *meritorious Cauſe*, or the *matter* of our principal Legal Righteouſneſs; if that be it that you mean by, [*in reſpect of it ſelf*:] Nor are we juſtified by *Chriſt* as a *Performer of the Goſpel-Conditions for us*, or a *Satisfier* for *final non-performance*. *Chriſt* hath his *own work*, and *Faith* hath *its own* office in our Juſtification. We are juſtified *by Faith it ſelf*, as the *Condition*, and not ſo by Chriſt.

Here I give you notice, that though the *act* of Faith be moſt directly the Condition, yet I think the

the *habit* is so intimately included in the true, serious, intense act, and is so little different in nature from it, that even the *habit* may be also called the *Condition*, and we be said to be justified by it. And indeed I think that the Scripture, when it speaks of being *justified by Faith*, doth in the word [*Faith*] include both *act and habit*. And I am conceited, that they less differ in their nature (*an act and an habit of the Soul*) than many Philosophers think: especially this would be evident, if *Scotus* were in the right, that *intellectio & volitio* compleated, which we call *immanent Acts*, are not in the predicament of *Action*, but of *Quality*, in the same *species* as *Habits*: Or if some others opinion be true, that *Habits* are but in the intellect the *Species* or Images deeply imprinted, and in the Will either none (besides the intellectual) or only a continued action, though sometimes so imperfect and obscure, that it is not perceived or felt, as being less vigorous and express than other actions which then are felt. Sure I am, if other men be no wiser than I, their apprehensions of the true nature of *Habits*, with their difference from *Powers* and *Acts*, is not so clear as may embolden a man with confidence, to reject *Habits* from being the *Condition*, and so having a hand with the *act* in our Justification. And whether it can truly be said, that the Habit is required only for the act, and not for it self, I cannot tell: I rather think otherwise. This I write, partly in Explication, and partly in Recantation of some things before delivered on this point, *Thes.* 57. which I think my self bound to do on more through Consideration.

2. In

2. In your second note: 1. You quite forget what you were to prove: It was not that the *Habit* of Faith is the Instrument, but the *Act*: For that is the common Doctrine, and that which I was there opposing. The *act* of the *Hand*, and and not the *Hand*, is it that you should prove the Instrument. You will not get all to confess, that the *act* of Faith is not the Instrument of receiving Christ, nor yet of Justification. 2. And if the *Habit* were granted to be the Instrument of receiving Christ, yet could it with no fitness be said, in the sense of our Divines, that Faith justifieth as an *Instrument*, because they say, It is not the *habit* of Faith that justifieth, but the *act*: And you say, It is not the *Act* that is the Instrument, but the *Habit*; therefore it plainly follows, that (according to this Doctrine) Faith cannot justifie as an Instrument. 3. I do not think that the *Habit* is properly the Souls Instrument. It is nothing but the *Perfection* of the *Faculty*; and its *Perfection* is too near to it self, to be properly its *Instrument*. Though in some sort we may say, that the *inferiour Powers* are the *Wills Instrumems* in *imperate Acts*; yet I do not think that the *elicite Acts* (such as are the acts of Faith) are performed by *Instruments*, except we may call the Body, the Spirits animal or vital, the Souls *Instruments*: (For though the Soul be *inorganical*, and depend not on the Body *subjectivè & efficienter*, yet I think it doth *objectivè & occasionaliter*, as *Heereboord* explains it (*Disput. Philos.* 43. §. 6. *p.* 615.) If we must not allow the Soul *exterior organs*, as *efficients* of its *elicite Acts*, I think we should have better grounds before we assert these *intrinsick organs*. We must make no unnecessary Composition

position in the Soul. Your similitude therefore of [*the Hand enriching*] is not to the purpose: For the hand is an integral part of the man, but no essential, and therefore may be called his Instrument: But *Faith* in the *Habit*, is the *Perfection* of his most *essential* part: And we think it not proper to say, that the soundness or perfection of the Brain or Heart are their Instruments. Or if it might be so said of the Body, yet must we be more cautelous in ascribing Divisions, Compositions and Instrumentality to the Soul. If any thing therefore (according to your similitude of a Hand) must be called the Instrument of receiving Christ, it must be that part of the Soul which receiveth him: But the Soul receiveth him not by parts, but intirely: The receiving Faculties are the Understanding (introductorily) and the Will (perfectively:) And to say that these are our Instruments of receiving, is to say, that the Soul is the Soul's Instrument, or Man's Instrument. If the meaning be, that the Soul is God's Instrument, I confess so some Philosophers and Divines usually say of all second Causes, that they are the Instruments of God the first Cause: But I know this is not your meaning, and therefore it might seem injurious or unnecessary to load it with the absurdities which follow it in our case.

3. Besides, it must be considered, that Faith is not a proper *natural receiving*, but a *moral imputative receiving* only. It is indeed *a physical Act*, but not *a physical Reception*. For, 1. *Credere est agere, sed recipere est pati: ergo credere non est recipere, sensu physico & proprio.* 2. The Object is not *naturaliter receptible* by our Faith: For, 1. If you say it is *Christ's Satisfaction* that is the *Object*. I answer,

1. That

1. That it was given to God, and not to us; it being God, and not we that was to be satisfied: It is only given to us in its *fruits* or benefits procured thereby, and not in it self. 2. If it were, yet it is not physically receptible. 2. If you say, It is [*Righteousness*] as ours, procured by Christ's Satisfaction: I say, Righteousness is a Relation, and not *physically receptible agendo vel apprehendendo.* 3. If you say that Christ himself is the Object; who knows not that our Faith doth not *physically* receive Christ himself? So that it's undeniable, that Faith is *actio physica, sed receptio tantum moralis vel imputativa:* And therefore (if all were granted, that before is gainsaid) the Habit of Faith could be no other Instrument of receiving, but moral or imputative.

4. Lastly, Let it be considered also, that the proper *justifying Faith* is not the *direct receiving* of *Righteousness*, but the *receiving of Christ himself*, as he is offered to us in the Gospel; that so *Righteousness* and other benefits may *follow* thereupon. So that it is but remotely, that justifying Faith receiveth Righteousness: So that as it is unmeet to say, that a Womans Habit of consenting, is the Instrument of enriching her, because she marrieth a man that is rich; so much more is it here. Indeed it is a phrase that containeth a whole heap of Metaphors and Metonymies in it.

But what need I contest any further with you, who are of the same judgment as I, and yield so willingly to all that I desire; that is, [*That to speak exactly, Faith may better be called a Condition, than an Instrument of our Justification:*] Why then do you except against my Exceptions against the improper

proper phrase ? If it satisfie you that I bear with the phrase, acknowledging itself improper (which I think is all you desire) then you may be satisfied in the words of mine you last cite : For I love not word-quarrels. But if you think, that I should have overlooked that impropriety, and not have gain-said it : I answer, indeed so I willingly would, but for these Reasons which forbid me : 1. Our Divines ordinarily use the phrase, as if it were exact and proper in their strictest Disputes. 2. They make the Instrumentality of Faith to Justification, the common refuge against many Objections, and the inlet of other mistakes. 3. They are impatient with any that deny it. 4. But that which chiefly moved me was, that they make this a main Fundamental difference between us and the Papists, as if for this one thing (if you joyn also their denial of the Imputation of Christ's personal active Righteousness, as our *formaliter, & non tantum meritorie*) which you and I deny as well as the Papists, and so doth every Divine save one, that hath yet afforded me their Animadversions; and what that one doth, I know not :) I say, as if for denying this, they were certainly damned. I confess it deeply troubleth me to read so ordinarily in our most famous Writers, so much of the Reformed Cause to be laid on a plain Errour. 5. And when Papists read this in our Writings, it so hardeneth them in their Religion, that they think presently, that all the rest of our Doctrine is like this, and they cast away all in prejudice, and insult over us, and cleave the faster to all the rest of their Errours, to their souls hazard. Judg impartially, Whether these Reasons were not sufficient to constrain me to find fault with

with this phrase of Instrumentality? 1. Specially if you do but add, that it is no phrase of the Holy Ghost, but of man's devising; and therefore I know not why I should in such a case be so tender of it.

Aphorism.

Page 226. LET *those therefore take heed, who make Faith to justifie, merely because it apprehendeth Christ, which is its natural, essential property.*

Animadverf.

I think few or none make Faith to justifie, merely because it apprehendeth Christ; but because it apprehendeth Christ as he is held out and offered in the Gospel for Righteousness to every one that believeth; and in this, as yet, I see no danger.

Reply.

1. I would they meant as well as you charitably interpret, or understood their own meaning as well as you would have them.

2. Your meaning can be no other than this, according to the proper importance of your words, that [*Faith justifieth quoad rationem formalem*, because the *Gospel giveth* Christ to *Believers*, that is, on *Condition of believing*; and *quoad rationem materialem vel aptitudinalem*, because *Faith is the acceptance of Christ*:] If this be not your meaning, I neither understand it, nor perceive how your words are explicatory.

Aphorism.

Ibid. THAT *it is Faith in a proper sense, and not Christ's Righteousness only, may appear thus:* 1. *From a necessity of a twofold Righteousness, which I have before proved from the twofold Covenant.*

Anim.

Animadverf.

I think I have before disproved that which you say concerning this twofold Righteousness; neither can I as yet see any necessity, nor indeed congruity of it. One Righteousness, *viz.* that of Christ imputed to us, is sufficient to justifie us; and therefore to make Faith, which is only requisite to that end, that Christ's Righteousness may be imputed to us, a distinct Righteousness whereby we are justified, to me seems very incongruous.

Reply.

Enough of this already, I think.

Aphorism.

Page 227. *IT had been as easie for the Holy Ghost to have said, That Christ only is imputed, or Christ only justifieth, if he had so meant.*

Animadverf.

1. In like manner do Papists stand upon *hoc est Corpus meum*, and dispute against our Exposition of those words.

2. The meaning of the Holy Ghost is to be gathered, by comparing one place of Scripture with another. Now as it is said, that *we are justified by Faith*, Rom. 3. 28. & 5. 1. so is it said, *By him* (*i. e.* by Christ) *all that believe are justified*, Acts 13. 39.

3. Therefore we are justified indeed by Christ, by his Righteousness imputed to us: Only Faith is required of us, that this benefit by Christ may be obtained; as the Medicine indeed doth heal, but yet it must be applied that it may do it.

Reply.

1. I hold fast the literal sense of Scripture, not as opposed to figurative (as the Papists in that point do;) but as it signifieth the plain meaning of the words, opposed to far-fetch'd forced Interpretation. For the figurative is oft the plain express sense, which is to be received according to the common use of those words. Again, if the Papists had divers express Texts of Scripture for

their opinion, and we had none againſt them, I would be of their mind. It is a deſperate thing to forſake the plain ſenſe of God's Word, becauſe Papiſts adhere to the literal ſenſe of one Text, againſt the plain more obvious figurative ſenſe, when alſo other Scriptures contradict them. If expreſs Scripture be no proof, when-ever men can put a forced ſenſe on it, or cannot reconcile it with other, what is a proof?

2. I agree to your Rule of Interpretation. But as to the Application, 1. You confeſs we are ſaid to be juſtified by Faith; and I confeſs we are juſtified by Chriſt. But doth it follow, that therefore we are not juſtified by Faith, becauſe we are juſtified by Chriſt? we are not fed by our hands or teeth, becauſe we are fed by our meat? 2. But the Queſtion was about [*imputing for Righteouſneſs.*] The Scripture ſaith, [*Faith is imputed for Righteouſneſs*;] but it no-where ſaith, *Chriſt or his Righteouſneſs is imputed to us for Righteouſneſs.* Now the Queſtion is, Whether by [*Faith,*] the Scripture mean (*not Faith*, but) [*Chriſt*, or his *Righteouſneſs*] and that only? He that will affirm this, muſt prove it. And do you indeed think, that when Scripture ſaith, [*Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for Righteouſneſs,*] James 2. 23. Rom. 4.22,23,24. that by [*it*] is meant [*Chriſt,*] or [*Chriſt's Righteouſneſs?*] Mr. *Wotton*, Mr. *Gataker*, and *Jo. Goodwin*, have ſaid enough of this. Do you by [*Faith*] mean [*Chriſt,*] when you ſay, *We are juſtified by Faith?* Do not you confeſs that we are *truly* juſtified by *Faith itſelf*, as the *Condition*, as well as by Chriſt as the *meritorious Cauſe?* Why then do you oppoſe the ſame in me? It may you will ſay, Becauſe

cause I say, Faith justifieth as our Righteousness. I answer, 1. That is not the Question now under hand; but, Whether it be *Christ only*, and *not Faith*. 2. In regard of that Justification which I believe you mean, *viz.* from the Accusation of the Law of Works as such: I say, *Faith is but a Condition*, and no otherwise justifieth. But because it is *made that Condition by a New-Law*, *per legem remediantem*, and we must be judged by *that Law*; therefore when the case is, Whether we have performed the Conditions of that New-Law or not? then Faith is *materially that Righteousness* by which we must be justified, against all Accusations of *non-performance*.

3. I have still acknowledged the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness *sano sensu*; (that is, 1. *Per Donationem ejus fructus*: And, 2. *Per Adjudicationem justitiæ, nobis inde promeritæ*;) but yet I see no such evidence in your Consequence, that should force me to leave the plain sense of any Text. The Antecedent I embrace, [*All that believe in Christ are justified*;] But I see not how it follows, [therefore *they are justified only by Christ's Righteousness imputed, and not by Faith imputed*;] (for that's it you must say, or you say nothing to the point.) Indeed you must interpret Imputation very fairly, before you can hence prove Imputation it self, much less the sole Imputation.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *Especially methinks, they that would have Faith to be the Instrument of Justification, should not deny that we are properly justified by Faith, as by an Instrument.*

Animadverſ.

1. They that make Faith the *Inſtrument* of Juſtification, underſtand it ſo, as that Faith is a *Condition requiſite* to Juſtification. B. *Davenant de Juſt. habit. c. 22. p. 312.* ſaith, *Luther* doth always acknowledg Faith *inſtrumentalem cauſam Juſtificationis*; yet *de Juſt. Act. c. 30. p. 387.* he ſaith, that to *believe, requiritur ut conditio prævia.*

2. They that make Faith the *Inſtrument* of Juſtification, ſo deny that we are properly juſtified by Faith, as they deny Faith to be that Righteouſneſs whereby we are juſtified; and hold, that we are ſaid to be juſtified by Faith, becauſe by it we are made partakers of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, which is the formal cauſe of our Juſtification. Thus B. *Davenant*, de Juſt. habit. c. 22. p. 312. *At inquit* Bellarminus, Lutheri *ſententia eſt formalem cauſam Juſtificationis eſſe fidem. Reſp. inſtrumentalem ſemper agnoſcit, non autem formalem, niſi quatenus ſub nomine fidei includit objectum fide comprehenſum; q. d. Chriſti obedientiam fide apprehenſam eſſe cauſam formalem Juſtificationis noſtræ non latuit hoc ipſos Papiſtas: Nam* Vaſquez *ſcribit, Quando apud* Lutherum *fides aſſeritur eſſe juſtitia noſtra formalis, ideo fides appellatur juſtitia, quia per eam apprehendimus Chriſti juſtitiam, qua Juſtificamur. Secundum ſententiam illorum commemorat qui Chriſti obedientiam & juſtitiam nobis imputatam ſtatuunt eſſe formalem cauſam Juſtificationis. At hæc communis eſt noſtrorum omnium ſententia: Neq; quod ad ipſam rem attinet, quiſquam è noſtris aliter aut ſenſit aut ſcripſit.* I do the rather cite the words of this Reverend and Learned Author, becauſe I find him highly prized by you, and that not without good cauſe, as I ſuppoſe.

Reply.

1. Your firſt note is little to the matter.

2. Your ſecond is too favourable an Interpretation, as to thoſe men that by their expreſs voluminous contradictions do confute you: Do they not maintain, that the Scripture by [*Faith imputed,*] means [*Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is imputed?*] and do they not thereby exclude [*Faith*] wholly, as to the ſenſe of that Text? My Queſtion was not, Whether it were Faith in this or another ſenſe? but, Whether it

it were *Faith at all* in *any* sense? or, Whether it were Christ's Righteousness only which Faith apprehendeth, and not at all Faith it self. Now if they do therefore exclude Faith, because they think the words, [*impute for Righteousness*,] would else make it our *Righteousness*; then they do exclude it wholly as to that Text? For if by [*Faith*,] be meant [*Christ's Righteousness*,] then what word doth signifie [*Faith?*] What ground soever they go on, it is evidently an unsound and forced Interpretation.

3. The words of *Davenant* which you cite, and divers others of his shew, that he was not of your mind or mine about the Righteousness imputed. It seems he discerned not the mistake of them that affirm the active Righteousness formally as such, to be our Righteousness.

4. I do highly reverence *Davenant*, and shall anon give you enough of his for the main point in question (about Works:) But far am I from owning this Doctrine which he makes to be *communis nostrorum sententia*; *viz.* That Christ's Righteousness is *formalis causa Justificationis*. I hold it to be *causa efficiens meritoria, quæ est quasi materialis*; but not *formalis*. For if you speak of *constitutive Justification active*, that is *formally actio Dei justificantis*, viz. *Donatio justitiæ*, called by Divines, *Imputation*. If you speak of *constitutive passive Justification*, it is nothing but the *Relation* of [*Justified*,] or [*Righte-*

Christi justitia in Justificatione fidelibus imputatur, quatenus ejus merito justi coram Deo reputamur, Amef. Medul. l. 1. c. 27. §. 12.

So *Alsted*. Distinc. Theol. c. 23. *Christus est justitia nostra in sensu causali non in sensu formali*. So *Revet*. Disp. de fide.

[*Righteousness*,] or [*non obligatus ad pœnam*,] and [*non condemnandus*:] And Christ's own Relation of [*non condemnandus*,] or [*just*] is not *formally* made ours; though *materially* it is. Accidents perish, if removed from their subject. If you speak of *Justification sententially*, surely none can imagine that the Righteousness of Christ is the *form* of that. But yet perhaps *Davenant* speaking less cautelously, might mean by [*Form*,] the same thing that I do by [*matter*, or *merit*.]

Aphorism.

Page 235. *THE bare act of believing, is not the only Condition of the New-Covenant, but several other duties are also parts of that Condition*, &c.

Animadvers.

I know no reason to deny this: But the New-Covenant containeth more in it than Justification; and therefore it follows not, that all other things which make up the Condition of the New-Covenant, must go before Justification, as the Condition requisite for the obtaining of it. Good-works and obedience follow after Justification, as the fruits of that Faith by which we are justified. They which have believed (and so are justified) must be careful to maintain good-works, Tit. 3.8. *Utcunq; bona opera, quæ sunt mandata in Lege requirantur necessario à Justificatis, ut fructus Sanctificationis & officia gratitudinis, tamen siquis ea exigat ut causas Justificationis, Christum ac fidem evacuat.* Daven. de Justit. act. cap. 30. p. 394. And besides, that we must first believe, and so be justified, before that we can do Good-works, our Good-works at the best are imperfect, and therefore we cannot be justified by them, *Psal.* 130. 3,4. & 143. 2.

Reply.

1. There is none of this against any thing that I say, except the last sentence. But it follows not, that because *Obedience followeth* Justification-begun, that

that therefore it is no Condition of its *continuance*; or that therefore it is no Condition of *sentential Justification* at Judgment.

2. I easily grant, that Faith or Works are no *causes* of our Justification (which *Davenant* meant) from the Accusation of the Law of Works; but *eo nomine*, because it is the Condition constituted by a New-Law, it must be the *subjectum primum* of our Justification, when the case is, *Whether that Condition be performed?* Will you tell me how you look to be justified, if the Devil accuse you to be *an Infidel*, a *finally impenitent person*, a *sinner against the Holy Ghost*, &c. even as if you were accused of being a *Traytor* to the State, by pleading your own Innocency, Righteousness, or Not-guiltiness.

3. The Imperfection of our Faith and Obedience, will prove that it cannot be our *universal* or *legal Righteousness*; but not that it is not our *performance of the Gospel-Condition*, and so our *justitia præstitæ Conditionis*.

Aphorism.

Page 236. THat *Love, and sincere Obedience, and works of Love, are also parts of the Condition, appeareth in these Scriptures*, Luke 7.47. (*though I know Mr.* Pink's *Interpretation of this*) &c.

Animadvers.

Mr. *Pink*'s Interpretation (as I remember, for I have not his Book by me now, though I have read it long ago) is this, that when it is said, *Luke* 7.47. *Her sins which are many are forgiven, for she loved much*: The particle *for* imports as much as *therefore*. His meaning is, that her loving much was not the cause why many sins were forgiven her; but this, that many sins were forgiven her, was the cause that she loved

much. And that this is the true and genuine meaning of the words (though there be no necessity of expounding *for* by *therefore*) appears by those which follow immediately after; *But to whom little is forgiven, the same loveth little*, viz. in comparison of him to whom much is forgiven. So also the Parable propounded by our Saviour, *v.* 41. *&c.* doth clearly shew the import of those words objected. Mr. *Pink*'s Interpretation therefore for the substance of it, is right and good, and in effect the same with *Calvin*'s, *Caterum hic dilectio non dicitur esse venia causa, sed posterius signum, ut prius admonui*, saith he upon the place. And at *v.* 41. *Mirum est plerosq; interpretes tam crasse hallucinatos esse; quasi hæc mulier veniam lachrimis, unctione, & osculis pedum pro merita sit. Nam argumentum quo utitur Christus, non à causa, sed ab effectu sumptum est: quia & prius ordine est beneficium accipere, quam habere gratiam; & causa mutui amoris hic notatur gratuita remissio.* Vid. etiam *Bezam* ad locum. Et *Amesi.* in *Bellarm.* Enerv. S. 1. c. 4. ad 4.

Reply.

I mentioned that Text among many more, not relying on that only or chiefly; and therefore added those words, not meaning thereby to deny Mr. *Pink*'s Interpretation: But *q. d.* yet I know Mr. *Pink* hath otherwise interpreted this, and much may be said for each sense. It is hard to be certain of the mind of the Holy Ghost, where the words will bear both senses. I remembred his Arguments, as well as his words; and I remember much that may be said against them. For my part, I determine it not: Let every one abound in his own sense, I see no reason to stand to dispute it.

Aphorism.

Page 240, 241. *THis preferring of Christ above all in Judgment, Will and Affection, is in my judgment the very essential property of true Faith, differencing it from all false Faith, and*

so

so an essential part of it: I know this is like to seem strange, &c.

Animadvers.

1. I know not why this should seem strange, if it be rightly understood. You say a little after, [*Affiance, and sincere Obedience, and works of Love, are the necessary, immediate, inseparable products of Faith:*] So the Apostle saith, *That faith worketh through love*, Gal. 5. 6.

2. Indeed I do not see how sincere Obedience, and works of Love, are the immediate products of Faith, as *Affiance* is. But, to let that pass; that they are the products of Faith, who will deny?

3. Yet are we not therefore justified by them, as well as by Faith, as it apprehendeth Christ and his Righteousness, as you seem to intend.

Reply.

1. If you knew how sharply I am dealt with for that passage, you would think my prognostick failed not, though you know not why any should think it strange.

2. As Affiance directly follows the Acceptance of Christ, as one to be trusted in; so internal Obedience directly followeth accepting of Christ, as King to rule us.

3. I there meddle not with your induced Consequence of Justification. But this follows: If it be a sufficient reason to exclude internal Obedience or Love to Christ, from being any of the Condition of Justification (as continued and sentential) because they are but fruits of the principal justifying Faith, then it would be a good reason to exclude Affiance. But it is confessed to be no good reason to exclude Affiance; therefore, *&c.* Again, if Affiance be but a fruit of the principal act of justifying Faith, and yet justifie it self, then it is not any one act only that justifieth: But, *&c.* therefore, *&c.*

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Page 243. *When we are said to be justified by Faith only, &c. all those forementioned duties are implied or included.*

Animadvers.

They are all implied or included as accompanying Faith, or proceeding from Faith, but not as concurring with Faith to Justification. *Bellarmin* confesseth that *Calvin* hath these words: *Sola fides est qua Justificat sed fides tantum qua Justificat non est sola: sicut calor solis solus est qui calefacit, ipse tamen non est solus, sed cum splendore.* And the same also he saith is taught by *Melancton*, *Brentius*, *Chemnitius*, *&c.* Bell. de Just. l. 1. c. 14.

Reply.

1. They are implied as *Conditional* to the *Continuation* and *Consummation* of that Justification, which is begun upon sole believing. As *Marriage-fidelity* is implied as *conditional* of the *Continuance* of that Womans interest in her Husband, and his riches and honours, which she *first received* upon mere *accepting* him or *Marriage*. For *Marriage* contains the *promise* of that *after-fidelity*: And sure the promise implieth the performance as necessary to follow. So is our Faith and accepting of Christ for Saviour and Lord, which containeth our Covenant to trust and obey him.

2. And some of them are implied as part of the *first Condition*, as *Repentance*, knowledg of Christ, love to Christ, desire after Christ, highly esteeming him, *&c.* My Reasons for this, and how far Faith is, or is not alone in justifying, follow after.

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Page 247. *This being well considered, will direct you where to find the very formal Being and Nature of Faith*, &c.

Animadvers.

The Nature of Faith, I think is fully set forth, *Heb.* 11. 13. in these words, *These all died in faith, having not received the Promises* (*i. e.* the things promised) *but saw them afar off, and were perswaded of them, and embraced them.* These words shew, that three things concur to make up Faith: 1. Knowledg; They saw the Promises, though afar off. 2. Assent; They were perswaded of them. 3. Application; They embraced them.

Reply.

This is the same that I constantly affirm: Only by [*Application*,] I doubt not you mean the act of the Will, Consent, Acceptance, Election, the same that Embracement in the Text is, and not that which some old great Divines call Application, *viz.* A believing that our own sins are pardoned. I am glad you see the inconvenience of making one single act only to justifie, or the act of one faculty only.

Aphorism.

Page 250. *Much less are any Promises or Benefits of Christ the proper Object of Justifying Faith, as many Divines do mistakingly conceive.*

Animadvers.

I confess I know not well what to make of this. Are no Promises the proper Object of justifying Faith? What hath Faith to lay hold on without a Promise? We cannot believe in Christ, but as he is promised and held out in the Gospel. First they saw the Promises, and then were perswaded of them, and embraced them, *Heb.* 11. 13. By the Promises (as I said)

are

are meant the things promised; but neither a Promise without a thing promised, nor a thing promised without a Promise, is imaginable. Perhaps you will say, The Promises are the ground of Faith, not the object of it. Indeed, if we distinguish betwixt a Promise, and a thing promised, yet the Promise it self must be believed: And indeed, neither can we believe a Promise, but we must believe the thing promised; nor can we believe a thing promised, but we must believe the Promise.

Reply.

I spake as other men, that make one object, even Christ himself to be the direct or proper object: But I repent of the narrow use of the word [*Proper Object*;] for indeed, God, Heaven, the Promise, the Benefits, may be called Objects of it too. Yet,

1. It is plainly expressed, and I doubt not but you have many a time read the like before in the Learnedst Divines; *viz.* That the object of that Faith which justifies, is not *axioma aliquod*, but an *incomplex term*, viz. *Christ himself*, Amef. Medull. l. 1. c. 3. §. 9. *In Scripturis vel promissionibus, enunciationes continent & exhibent objectum fidei, vocanturq; objectum fidei per metonymiam adjuncti. Bonum quod proponitur assequendum qua tale, est finis & effectum fidei, non proprie objectum ipsum: Illud vero cujus vi nitimur, in assecutione boni illius est proprium objectum fidei,* 1 Cor. 1. 23. *Prædicamus Christum, &* 2. 2. *non statui quicquam sci inter vos nisi Jesum Christum,* 2 Cor. 5, 19. *Deus in Christo.* So also *cap.* 27. §. 15,17. *Fides igitur illa proprie dicitur Justificans qua incumbimus in Christum ad remissionem peccatorum & salutem. Christus enim est adæquatum objectum fidei, quatenus fides Justificat. Fides enim non alia ratione Justificat nisi quatenus apprehendit*

prehendit illam justitiam propter quam Justificamur: Illa autem justitia non est in veritate alicujus axiomatis, cui assensum præbemus, sed in Christo solo, 2 Cor. 5. 21. *Hinc toties illæ in N. T. repetitæ conciones quæ Justificationem in persona sola Christi quærendam ostendunt*, Joh. 1. 12. & 3. 15,16. & 6. 40, 47. & 14.1,54. Rom.4.5. & 3.26. Acts 10. 43. & 25.18. Gal. 3. 26. So also in *Disput. de Fid. divin. verit.* And I have shewed you, *Append.* p. 111,112, &c. that Dr. *Preston* and others most frequently have the same.

2. I fully enough (I thought) opened my meaning to you to this effect. Justifying Faith is the motion of the *whole Soul to Christ*. It containeth therefore the action of *both Faculties*. In the *intellect* Assent is its act, and the *Word* or *Promise* is *its neareſt object*, though not its *chief* (as I opened my meaning, *p.* 260.) For as *Ames. Medul.* l. 2. c. 5. §. 23, 24. *Hoc objectum est immediatè semper aliquod axioma vel enunciatio sub ratione veri, sed illud in quo principaliter terminatur fides, de quo & propter quod assensus præbetur illi axiomati per fidem, est ens incomplexum sub ratione boni*, Rom. 4.21. Heb. 11.13. *Actus (enim) credentis non terminatur ad axioma, sed ad rem, fatentibus scholasticorum clarissimis. Ratio est: quia non formamus axiomata, nisi ut per ea de rebus cognitionem habeamus. Principalis igitur terminus in quem tendit actus credentis, est res ipsa, quæ in axiomate præcipue spectatur.* But as the act of the *Understanding* is but *preparatory*, introductory and subservient to that of the *Will*, whereby the Soul cleaveth to *God as good*, being but the *means* to it, or the imperfect Rudiments of it: So *Assent* to the *truth* of the *Promise*, is but such an initial or introductory

ductory act, as to *Consent*, or the *Wills Acceptance* of the *good offered*. These acts of the intellect (in affectionate or practical matters) are but imperfect acts of the Soul, and so but *imperfecte humani vel morales*: And therefore we commonly distinguish *intellectual* Acts and Vertues from *moral*. Not that I think they are not truly *humani & morales*, but it is in a more *imperfect kind*; as the digestion in the stomach, before Sanguification: Nor do I agree to *Amesius*, who placeth justifying Faith *only in the Will* (no more than to *Camero*, who placeth it *only* in the *Intellect*:) But till it come to the Will, it is not *perfect*, nor so fully to be ascribed to the *whole man*. And therefore saith *Gibieuf* de Libert. *Finis intellectus est veri notitia, sed finis hominis intelligentis est amor Dei*. As the *sense* is *for the Intellect*, so the *Intellect* is *for the Will* here. And therefore it is the act of the *Will* that is the *compleat* and *principal act* of justifying Faith, and the object of that act is the *proper principal object* of justifying Faith.

Now this compleat principal act of Faith; (*viz.* The *Will's Acceptance*, *Election* or *Consent*, *velle bonum oblatum*) hath not the *Word* or *Promise* for

I mean not by all this, that only this which I call the principal act, is the Condition of our Justification; but that it is the most *special* act implying the rest, as the generical. Yea, and the final object is the principal in excellency; as the end is better than the means as such, though the mediate object be the special proper object. And as when believing and consenting to my Physician, importeth that health and life is my end, and is so included or connoted in his Office or Relation: So Heaven, that is, God to be perfectly loved, and enjoyed, and obeyed, is the end of Christ's Mediatorship, and the final and most excellent object of our Faith.

its

its proper material object; but Christ himself, as in his Office, and *to the ends* and *uses* of that Office; and so the benefits are final or remoter objects indeed, and still implied. The accepting of the *Word*, or the accepting of *Justification*, are neither of them this *compleat special act of justifying Faith*; but the *accepting of Christ*. As the act wherein the essence of Marriage doth principally consist, is not believing each others *words* (which is pre-requisite) nor yet accepting the riches or honours of each other: But accepting each other in the Conjugal Relations; or the *Wills consent* (and its *expression*, if we speak of it *quoad forum exterius*.) And the Condition of a womans enjoying her Husband's honour and estate, is not principally her *believing him*, nor yet her *accepting his honour and estate*; but her *accepting himself in Marriage*. So I think it is here. Yet the truth of God or his Word, is the object of that introductory initial act of justifying Faith, called *Assent*. Methinks this is so plain, that you may well know what to make of it. *Neq; nobis absurdum videtur, sed valde consentaneum, actum illum quo tota anima Purificatur & Justificatur ad totam animam pertinere: ita ut in nudo intellectu habeat initium, in voluntate complementum.* Davenant. Deter. Q. 37. p. 166.

Aphorism.

Page 255. *TO the 66. that Christ as a Saviour only, or in respect of his Priestly Office only, is not the object of justifying Faith, but that Faith doth as really and immediately receive him as King, and in so doing justifie: This I prove thus,* &c.

Anim.

Animadverſ.

1. The Arguments which you uſe, prove only thus much, that Chriſt muſt be received as well in reſpect of his Kingly, as in reſpect of his Prieſtly Office; But not that we are juſtified by the one, as well as by the other. Still we muſt diſtinguiſh *inter fidem quæ Juſtificat, & fidem quâ Juſtificat. Obſervandum eſt* (ſaith *Ameſius*) *nos non reſtringere fidem illam quæ Juſtificat, ſed tantum qua Juſtificat, ad permiſſionem miſericordiæ.* Ames. in Bellar. Ener. *l.* 5. *c.*1.

2. If Chriſt's *Satisfaction* be our Righteouſneſs whereby we are juſtified, and Chriſt as Prieſt ſatisfied for us; then by *receiving him as Prieſt*, we are juſtified: Though it's true, none can indeed receive him as Prieſt, except they receive him as King alſo.

Reply.

1. I think the Arguments uſed, if rightly taken, prove more than you ſay. But becauſe I come newly from manifeſting their forms and vigour, to two or or three other Learned Animadverters, I ſhall not attempt it again on this ſhort invitation.

2. You confeſs I have proved the receiving Chriſt as King, to be the *fides quæ Juſtificat:* And then it belongs *to you* to prove the *excluſion* of it in this Conſideration: Scripture ſaith, *We are juſtified by faith:* You confeſs, it is by *this faith*, or *this act*: If therefore you ſay moreover, *It is by this*, but *not as ſuch*, you muſt prove the *excluſion* of that reſpect; for *ubi Lex nec diſtinguit nec limitat, non eſt diſtinguendum vel limitandum.* He therefore that affirms the Diſtinction or Limitation, muſt prove it. Which I deſpair of ſeeing well done here.

3. I reverence thoſe Learned Divines, that uſe to diſtinguiſh of the *fides quæ*, and the *fides quâ:* But indeed, I am paſt doubt, that it is here a uſeleſs diſtinction, and only built on a begging of the Queſtion. The word [*qua*] reſpecteth either [*Juſtificat*,]

cat,] or, [*fides.*] *Fides quâ Justificat, tantum Justificat: Ita enim loquimur non quid sit, sed quid producit.* If you refer [*qua*] to [*fides*,] so as to mean, *Fides quâ Christi sacerdotis apprehensio Justificat, & tantum quâ talis*: Then, 1. This is inconveniently expressed, to say [*qua Justificat*,] instead of [*quâ Christum apprehendit.*] 2. And it is a begging of the Question. It supposeth, that [*hæc fides, vel hic fidei actus qua talis, & non qua conditio formaliter Justificat*,] which I deny: Yea, and it supposeth that *solus hic actus Justificat*, which is also denied.

4. I would you would shew me, in what sense or respect it is, that the *receiving of Christ as King* doth *justifie*. You say, it is the *fides quæ Justificat*: And then it is certainly *a justifying act*: Now if it do justifie, and yet not *qua talis*, as such as it is, then as what? It is not the same act most say, as the *receiving Christ as Priest*: Will you say, [*The receiving Christ as King*] doth justifie, as it is the receiving him *as Priest?* that were to say, [*by doing that which it doth not*,] according to the common judgment. But if you mean, that it is the *same Habit*, which performeth *both Acts*, and only *one* of the Acts justifie: I say, you should then call the *Habit only*, and that *one Act*, the *fides quæ*; and not *that act* which is not the *fides quæ* (in your esteem.)

Of this read what I have written at large against Mr. *Warner*; about the Object of justifying Faith.

5. The [*quâ*] should signifie the *formal Reason* of its *interest* in the work of Justifying. But that (I think I have proved, and shall do) is not *its nature*, as it is *this Act* or *that* (that is but *its Aptitude* to this Office) but its being the *Condition* of Justi-

fication, which *God* hath *instituted*, and *man performed*. If therefore it justifie not *qua fides, vel quâ hic actus*, but *quâ conditio præstita*, then *every Act* must justifie, which is such *a Condition*: For *à quatenus ad omne valet argumentum.*

6. Your own Argument I grant wholly [*If Christ as Priest satisfied*, &c.] But all you conclude is, that [therefore *by receiving him as Priest we are justified.*] But who denieth it? You left out Ip [*only*:] Which had you put in, I had denied the Consequence with that addition. It is such another Argument as this: *If a man only as rich, do enrich his wife; and only as honourable, do honour her; and only as merciful and potent, doth deliver her from danger: then the Act on her part which enricheth her, is only the receiving him as a rich man; and not as an honourable man, nor as a husband only: And the Act which dignifieth her, is only the receiving him as honourable.* No such matter! But the receiving him as a *Husband* (though she never look to his riches or honour) is that Act on her part, which *giveth right* to his riches, honour and all: And then these benefits are but consequential thereto.

7. Let me therefore here once for all (that you may understand my meaning) tell you, That when we say [*Faith justifies in this respect, and not in that,*] *distinguendum est*: Either we speak *ex parte objecti* only, in what respect the *Object received* doth justifie; or else *ex parte actus nostri*, in what respect *our Act of Faith* justifieth: And so I affirm *ex parte objecti* (I speak not *de objecto formaliter, sed materialiter in se*) that *Christ received*, doth not justifie (*satisfactorily* and *meritoriously*) as *King*, but as *Priest*: (Though yet *sententialiter & ut efficiens principalis*, he

he justifies as *King*.) But if the Question be, *Ex parte actus nostri?* I say, it is not our receiving Christ *as Priest only*, nor as *King*, but as the *Mediator-God-man*, to be our *Head*, *Husband*, *Lord* and *Saviour* that justifieth, as being the *Condition* on which Justification is *given* us: And so receiving him *as King*, hath *as near* a hand in it, as receiving him as *Priest*; (for this is that *part of the Condition* which the World *most sticks* at.) As in the forementioned similitude *ex parte objecti*, the *husbands dignity* doth not *enrich* the wife, nor his *riches ennoble* her: But *ex parte actus*, as to the *Condition* on *her part*, it is *undivided* as to the essential Matrimonial respects, *viz.* [That she take the man to be *her husband*, to be loved, obeyed, and faithfully cleave to him only:] But the respect to his *riches* and *honour* in marrying him, is not that which gives her title to them; (that is, but collaterally requisite, if at all;) but her first having right *in him*, whose they are.

Aphorism.

Page 259. IF *Mr.* Cotton *say, as the Lord* Brook *represents him, That Faith can be nothing else but a laying hold of that Promise which God hath made, it is a foul errour*, &c.

Animadvers.

I presume Mr. *Cotton* by [*Promise*,] meant the [*Promise as containing Christ in it*,] and that he spake of Faith *as justifying*. *Quamvis multa sint exercitia & objecta fidei, non tamen Justificans est, nisi prout respicit misericordiam Dei in Christo.* Ames. Bell. Enerv. *l.* 5. *c.* 2. *ad* 8.

Reply.

I like your fair Exposition; whereby you leave the Errour, as being in his language, and not in his

ſenſe. For as *Chriſt is*, ſaith *Ameſ. Objectum adæquatum fidei Juſtificantis*, ſo [*nothing elſe but*] is too palpable an excluſion in all appearance: And no exact man in defining, ſhould either *exclude*, or *but imply* the adequate object of that Act which he defineth. But I truly love charitable Interpretation, and only endeavour to keep the *ill ſenſe* out of credit, and not ſo Reverend a man.

Aphoriſm.

Page 266. I *Take Love to be ſome degree of juſtifying Faith, and not properly a fruit of it.*

Animadverſ.

I think it is properly a fruit of juſtifying Faith. *We love him, becauſe he loved us firſt*, 1 John 4.19. His love apprehended by us, which is by Faith, doth work in us love towards him again. For otherwiſe, though God love us never ſo much, yet if we do not apprehend it, we ſhall not therefore love him. B. *Davenant* de Juſt. act. *c.* 30. *p.* 387. reckons *amare Deum, inter effecta à fide Juſtificante neceſſariò manantia.*

Reply.

To your Argument I anſwer:

1. The Text may argue, not *à ratione objectivâ*; but *à ratione efficiente*; *q. d.* Becauſe he firſt loved us, therefore hath he prevented us by his Grace, and given us hearts to love him again.

2. If you were ſure it argued *à ratione objectivâ*, yet you endeavour to prove no more, but that the *aſſenting act* of *Faith* goes before love; which I affirm as much as you, while I ſay, it goes before Conſent, Acceptance, Election.

3. Your Argument, as you urge it, tends to prove that *Love*, even in *time* follows Faith: Yet you never yet denied that *Acceptance* and *Election* is a juſtifying act: And can you think, that *Acceptatio*

ceptatio vel Electio boni, hath no *love* in it, but is wholly antecedent? or that the Apostles ἀσπάσμοι, *embracing*, Heb. 11. 13. which you cited, containeth *no love* in it? Your Friend and mine Mr. *Leigh* thought it did. See what he citeth, *Crit. Sacr.* out of *Davenant*, and *Beza*, and *Paræus*, *Est amanter amplecti, & salutare & osculari.*

4. The first orderly *love to God* in the Soul ariseth not from our *belief* or *assurance*, that he *loves us in particular* more than others of the World, but from the apprehension of his *natural excellency*, *goodness*, and *common love to mankind in giving Christ for them*, and in him *offering to be* freely reconciled to them, and tendring Christ, and Pardon, and Salvation to them; upon the *belief* of *which*, they *lovingly accept* Christ offered, which is the compleat act of justifying Faith, being the Marriage between Christ and the Soul. And so, as you may say, the *compleat act* of Faith, is a fruit of the *incompleat act*: So you may say, that *this love* is a fruit of *this belief*.

5. And I need not again tell you, that I neither speak of any *other love* here, but *love to the accepted Redeemer*, or *Head* and *Husband Christ* (whom we do not *accept* or *marry first*, and only *after love* him, but do *lovingly accept*) nor of the *following acts of love* in our lives, which may be called the fruits of our first *loving acceptance*. Chamier. Panstrat. de Fide, l. 12. c. 4. (mihi) p. 375. *Omnis amor est actus voluntatis: At fides est amor: ergo, &c. minor probatur. Vera fides est ea quæ credit in Deum: At credere in Deum est amare Deum, &c.*

6. *Aquinas*, and others ordinarily say, That *Love*, as it is in the *rational part*, is nothing but *Velle*, 1, 2. *q.* 22. *a.* 3. 3. *&* 1. *q.* 20. *a.* 1. so *Zanchius* very

oft. So *Tolet.* de Anima. in l. 3. c. 9. q. 27,28. *Circa bonum prima passio est amor. Amor est omnium prima & ipsarum parens, &c. Amor est,* 1. *Concupiscentiæ.* 2. *Benevolentiæ vel amicitiæ. Ille est velle bonum ad se ordinando, &c. Alter est velle bonum propter seipsum, &c.* Vid. ultra. So *Gerson* part. 4. fol. 27. *de Passionibus animæ,* Amesius contr. Grevinchov. pag. 16. Abundance more I could cite, specially Philosophers, to the same purpose, but that I will not so trouble you and my self in vain. Now certainly *Acceptance* is *velle bonum*; and certainly before *velle* there is no act of the Will to good.

7. I deny not *amare Deum* to be an effect, in the sense oft explained already.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *The Will's apprehension of a thing good, which we call an earnest willing of it, and accepting it, is (in my judgment) the same thing as Love,* &c.

Animadversi.

You speak of a thing *present and enjoyed*; and so distinguish justifying Faith from Desire and Hope: [*Desire and Hope* (say you, *p.* 267.) *as such, do properly consider their Object as absent, which this justifying Faith doth not.*] Now Christ must be received by Faith, that so he may be *present* and *enjoyed*, and consequently, that he may be loved as such. And therefore Love in this sense is rather a fruit of Faith, than a part of it, as you endeavour to prove.

Reply.

1. As Desire and Hope consider their Object as Absent, so they are only, *quoad accidentalem hunc respectum*, different from love, and not from any real essential objective difference.

2. Faith

2. Faith and Love here do consider their Object as alike present. There is no need of Faith to make it present before it can be accepted and loved; it is God's offer that makes it present: And he offers it me to be at once *lovingly accepted*, and not to be first accepted, and then *loved* only.

3. We look not at Christ as [*enjoyed*] when we first *love* him; but as *bonum conveniens* offered to be enjoyed.

4. If by [*receiving by Faith*,] you mean, [*Assent to the truth of the Word*,] then it is true, that this must go before Love: But it is as true, that it must go before Acceptance.

Aphorism.

Page 267. IF *Love be an act of the same Will, and have the same Object with Consent, Election, Acceptance*, &c. *Why should it not then be the same Act?*

Animadvers.

Love, as you take it, considereth its Object as present and enjoyed; therefore it differs from Consent, Election and Acceptance, which go before Enjoyment: So much your self confesses immediately, saying, [*Acceptance considereth* its *Object as offered*; *Election considereth it as propounded with some other Competitor*; *Consent considereth it as we are perswaded and invited to it.*]

Reply.

Neither so, nor so.

1. I never thought that *all Love* considereth its Object as *present*, much less *as enjoyed*; but only *amor complacentiæ*. I only said, that Love considereth it *not as absent* (as *Desire* and *Hope* do;) that is, It is not necessary to the denomination of Love, that we consider the Object *as absent*: I spoke negatively,

tively, not that I ever thought it necessary, that therefore it must consider it as present and enjoyed: Love considereth it more simply than other Passions do, that is, as *bonum conveniens*: It is *accidental* to it, to consider it *as absent*, or *as present*. Therefore Desire and Hope are Love with such an accidental variation.

2. As the said *accidental differences* of the *Object* in mere extrinsick respects, do not make the Object to be divers: (It is not *one good* that *is offered*, and *another* that is *deliberated* on, and *another* that we are *fore-invited* to;) so they make not *Acceptance*, *Election*, *Consent*, to be *several acts*, much less one to follow another as their fruit: No more doth it make *Love* to differ from them. All is but *velle bonum*, viz. *Christum oblatum*. Cannot mine eye see at once this wall as it is *white*, as it is *quantum*, as it is *unum*, as it is thus or thus scituate, standing East or West, facing that other Wall, near to this Wall, and like to it, *&c.* Must all these be several acts in the substance, and one the fruit of another?

Aphorism.

Ibid. *But all these are extrinsick Considerations: They consider their Object as good, and so doth Love.*

Animadvers.

But that is not enough to make them and *Love* all one. For so Desire and Hope consider their Object as good, yet are not therefore the same with Consent, Election, Acceptance, nor yet with Love, as the Object of it, is Good-enjoyed: For the Object of Desire and Hope, is Good-absent.

Reply.

It is not enough to give *Love* the *name* of *Acceptance* or *Consent*, &c. But it is enough to prove

Acceptance

Acceptance and *Consent* to be *Love*. *Love* is the substance of the Act; the other are the same Act, as respecting the same Object, but not simply as *good*, but with the addition of some respects extrinsecal. The *Genus* is truly in the *Species*, though the *Species* is not the *Genus*, nor the *Genus* to be called by the name of the *Species*. *Amare & velle bonum*, is all one. Acceptance, Election, Consent are all *velle*; but not *velle bonum simpliciter*, *sed cum hoc vel illo respectu superaddito:* And therefore *omne velle non est acceptare*, sed *omne acceptare est velle*. *Et ita dicendum de Amore.*

Aphorism.

Page 268. *IT is not said, that Love justifieth, but Faith that worketh (even in its essential work of accepting) by Love.*

Animadvers.

So Love must needs be taken for Desire, not for that Love which is carried out towards a thing enjoyed, which is *Amor complacentiæ*. But I do not conceive that to be the Apostle's meaning, Gal. 5. 6. *Quantum ad præsentem locum attinet*, Paulus *nequaquam disputat, an charitas ad justificandum co-operatur fidei, sed tantum indicat quæ nunc sint vera fidelium exercitia, &c. ergo cum versaris in causa Justificationis cave ullam charitatis vel operum mentionem admittas, sed mordicus retine particulam exclusivam.* Calv. ad loc.

Reply.

1. *Amor desiderii*, vel *concupiscentiæ*, is as common a phrase as *Amor complacentiæ*.

2. It is as proper to say, *Desire* is *Love*, or *Complacency* is *Love*; as to say, *Amor concupiscentiæ*, & *Amor complacentiæ*. Both phrases express that there *is Love*, with an additional respect.

3. I love to interpret Scripture in the most comprehensive sense: To say the Apostle excluded this operation,

operation, may be sooner done, than to prove it: But of that, judg as you see meet.

4. *James* took not *Calvin*'s counsel in his phrase of Speech.

Aphorism.

Page 269. *Christ doth propound it* (viz. *Love*) *in the Gospel, as of the same necessity*, &c.

Animadvers.

Love, and all obedience, are propounded as necessary, but not as necessary to Justification. They flow from justifying Faith, but are not properly parts of it.

Reply.

(1.) *John* 16. 27. & 14. 21. Makes *Love* the *antecedent Condition* of *God's Love* and *Christ's Love* to the person. And that goeth with *Remission*, and is a Love of Reconciliation: And Reconciliation comprehendeth Remission. At least, you will never shew out of Scripture, that the *procuring God's Love*, and the procuring *Remission* and *Reconciliation*, have not the same *Conditions*.

(2.) Love is confessed a Condition of our *Glorification*, Jam. 1.12. & 2. 5. *John* 14.21, *&c.* And it is to me past doubt, that *Glorification*, and *sentential Justification* at *judgment*, have the *same Conditions*.

3. I easily acknowledge, that *Obedience* is a fruit of Faith, and not a part of it, properly taken: And so is *other Love*.

Aphorism.

Page 270, 271. *That both* (viz. *Faith and Love*) *are necessary to Justification, is doubtless, and that they are concurrent in apprehending Christ.*

Anim.

Animadverſ.

This which you ſay is *doubtleſs*, is generally not *doubted*, but *denied* by our Divines. Love, as diſtinguiſhed from Deſire, preſuppoſeth Chriſt already apprehended, and ſo Juſtification already obtained; and therefore it doth not concur with Faith in apprehending Chriſt, nor is it neceſſary to Juſtification.

Reply.

1. Either you or I miſtake the common judgment of Divines. How many have anſwered me (beſides all that I have read) that Love is neceſſary *quoad præſentiam, ſed non quoad Inſtrumentalitatem, vel Cauſalitatem.* Nay how many have told me of *Works themſelves* (much more of *Love*) that they are indeed *Conditions of our Juſtification*, but not *Inſtruments:* (ſo Mr. *Ball* of the Covenant;) and chiefly blame me, that I bring them ſo near together, by not giving more to Faith, than merely to be a *Condition*; which (ſay they) *Works* are as well as Faith. Nay, how commonly do ours on *James* 2. and againſt the Papiſts ſay, that *Fides ſolum juſtificat, ſed non ſola:* Faith without Works in *Cauſality*, but not in *Concomitancy*. And if it be not *ſola without Works*, ſure not *without Love*. Though for my part I affirm, that as to Works of *external Obedience*, it is *ſolum & ſola* in our firſt Juſtification.

It is not true, that all Complacence ſuppoſeth the Object, either preſent or enjoyed; but only that *in eſſe cognito*, as *apprehended good*, it be complacential to the will of the perſon who thinketh of it. And there is Complacency in all Deſire and Hope, yea, in our grief, for not enjoying the good.

2. You intimate a Conceſſion, that *Amor concupiſcentiæ* is pre-requiſite. And I ſpeak not of *Amor complacentiæ*, as reſpecting the Object *enjoyed:* But indeed

indeed of *Amor acceptationis vel electionis*, as properly so called as either of the other.

3. Acceptance presupposeth the Promise to be believed as true, and Christ to be known to be good; and yet Justification is not attained before that Acceptance or Love. But all Love doth not presuppose Acceptance, Consent, Election or Affiance, no more than *velle* presupposeth them. The names plainly evince this.

Aphorism.

Page 286. *AS the accepting of Christ for Lord (which is the* hearts Subjection) *is as essential a part of justifying Faith, as the accepting him for Saviour: So consequently, sincere Obedience (which is the effect of the former) hath as much to do in justifying us before God, as (some) Affiance, *which is the fruit of the latter.*

* Yet no doubt but *trust* in *Christ* is an essential act of Faith: And I spake not here distinctly enough of Affiance; but meant only a *quieting* trust: But all true belief is a trusting to his Word or Veracity; that is, to his Wisdom, Goodness and Power whom we believe.

Animadvers.

(1.) This accepting of Christ for Lord, is as essential a part of justifying Faith, as the accepting him for Saviour; but not of Faith as justifying. Christ is our Saviour in satisfying for us, and in that respect doth Faith apprehend Christ, as it justifieth.

(2.) For Faith justifieth, as it apprehendeth Christ's Satisfaction, which is that Righteousness whereby we are justified.

Reply.

(1.) I have already answered this of *fides quæ & qua*. I take your Concession for the *quæ*, and stay till you either prove the *quâ* as contradistinct,

or

or this distinction to have tolerable sense, when well scan'd.

(2.) I mainly differ with you in the last point, which is your ground-work in other differences. Faith justifieth not directly, as it apprehendeth Christ's Satisfaction (you should say, *Righteousness* which was *merited by it:* For the *Satisfaction it self* was never *offered to us*, but *given to God for us*; unless by *apprehending*, you mean only *assenting* to the *truth* of it:) But Faith justifieth directly or *formally*, as the *Condition of the Gift*; and *materially* or *aptitudinally*, as the *receiving of Christ himself:* And then his Righteousness is to follow our Union or Marriage to him. Doth not Union go before Justification? Remember I distinguished before *ex parte actus & ex parte objecti.*

Aphorism.

Page 288. *THis Accepting, which is a* Moral receiving, *doth not, nor possibly can make Christ ours immediately and properly, as it is a* receiving: *But mediately and improperly only; the formal cause of our interest, being God's* Donation *by the Gospel-Covenant.*

Animadvers.

Accepting is properly the receiving of a *thing offered*: And so our Accepting, presupposeth God's offer; our receiving, supposeth his Donation: And I should rather think that it is not God's offer and Donation, but our accepting and receiving, which doth immediately make Christ ours. The Gospel-Covenant is held out to many, who yet have no interest in Christ, because they have not faith to accept and receive him, *John* 1. 11,12. *Acts* 13. 38,39,40,41.

Reply.

Reply.

This is a point of greater moment than to all appears: But as to your Objection, it is of most facile solution. There are two acts of God's Donation to be distinguished, which you confound: 1. One is his *making* the *conditional Covenant* or *Gift*: This was a *natural act* past long ago, and our *Acceptance* supposeth it past. 2. The second is the *moral act* of this *Covenant*, *Deed of Gift*, or Law once made. This *moral action* is considerable, 1. As *before* our performance of the Condition; and that is imperfect, and properly no action, as to *giving*: For it is essential to a Condition, to *suspend* the act of the Law, Grant, or other instrumental Donation. 2. But when the *Condition is performed*, then the Law or Covenant doth *truly agere* or *significare*, and *give Christ* and *Righteousness*. For though the Instrument were in *being before*, yet it did not *agere vel efficere*, till the Condition was performed. And this is common in moral Action or Efficiency, to delay so long, and begin on such terms: And the reason is, because all its force for Action is from the *Will* of the *Law-giver* or *Donor*: For it worketh but as *signum voluntatis ejus*. Now it is *his Will* that a conditional Grant shall not act, or be effectual till the Condition be performed, and therefore it cannot before. If a man make a *Testament*, giving so much to such a Son when he marrieth, and so much to another on such a *Condition* (as if it were but *thankful Acceptance*) this *Testament* will *not give* them any *actual right*, till the *Condition* be performed. So I answer you; Our *Acceptance* supposeth *God's Grant*, as made in the *Instrument*, and supposeth it *conditionally* to be ours; but as truly supposeth,

poseth, that *actually* it is *not ours* till *Acceptance*; the Law till then suspending its act. Indeed if it had been an *absolute Grant*, it had been otherwise: For then the receiving would have been necessary only in natural, and not moral respect; and only *ad possessionem & non ad jus*. And yet some Grants use to be made in *phrase* of *absolute ones*, which yet imply *Consent* or *Receiving* to be *conditional*, because it is seldom convenient to make over any gift upon other terms: (Yet sometimes it is.) Can you think indeed (as you seem to intend) that all God's Agency is past before we believe, and that he doth nothing after? Why then he justifieth men before Faith *ex parte sui*, as fully as after; and the Reprobate as fully as the Elect: But both these are false. Indeed God doth no natural action after (it is *ex vi Legislationis*, that the *Law* doth still afterward act) but the *moral act* of his Law, which is *debitum constituere*, *jus conferre*, is *after our Faith immediately*: and this is the act that we are chiefly to look at. You say, the Gospel-Covenant is held out to Unbelievers, and what of that? Doth it therefore *give right in Christ to Unbelievers?* Or doth *Faith* it self *give* that *right?* Or did God before give it *absolutely*, and they only lose the possession for want of a Reception merely natural? No, none of all this.

Aphorism.

Ibid. IF *the Covenant make Christ as King, the Object of that Faith which is its Condition, * as well as Christ as a Deliverer or Priest, then may it be as fit a* medium *for our Justification as the other.*

* *Viz.* Of Justification.

Anim.

Animadverſ.

It doth not follow, becauſe the Covenant extends to more than Juſtification; and Juſtification it ſelf requires that Chriſt be received as King, yet not that Juſtification may be obtained, but becauſe it is obtained.

Reply.

1. You might eaſily diſcern from what went before, that I ſpoke of the *Condition of Juſtification.*

2. I perceive now that you think the *receiving Chriſt as Prieſt*, and *as King*, are two diſtinct acts; and that the former alone juſtifieth us, not only without the other, as a *Condition*, but even without its *preſence*, which is but to *follow* becauſe we *are juſtified.* Contrary, He that receives not Chriſt as Chriſt, (that is, in all the eſſentials of his Mediatory Office) doth not receive him, ſo as to be juſtified by him. But he that receives him only as Prieſt, and not as King, doth not receive him as Chriſt; therefore, *&c.* The Scripture calleth him *Chriſt*, *the Anointed*, more fully and frequently, in reſpect to the Kingly part of his Office than any. A falſe Faith doth not juſtifie: But to receive Chriſt only as a Prieſt, and not as King, is a falſe Faith; therefore, *&c.* Again, He that knows not Chriſt to be the King of the Church by Office, and *de jure* the *Ruler* of his Soul, knows him not with a true knowledg (no more than he that knows not that a man hath a head, but only a heart, hath a true knowledg of man;) therefore ſo to receive him is no true receiving. And if he know him to be King, and yet receive him not as ſuch, then it is worſt of all. Laſtly, To receive Chriſt ſo as he was never offered, is no true receiving: But to receive him as Prieſt only, is ſo to receive him as he was never offered; there-

therefore, &c. And therefore this receiving which you speak of doth not justifie.

Aphorism.

Page 289. I *Take it for granted, that Dr.* Downam's *Arguments in the place forecited, have proved* Affiance *to be but a fruit of the principal justifying act of Faith.*

Animadvers.

I cannot examine those Arguments, not having the Book wherein they are contained. But *Affiance* being taken for a Recumbency on Christ, it seems to be a principal part of justifying Faith, as being that which the phrase of *Believing in Christ*, so frequent in Scripture doth import, and which is meant by *embracing*, Heb. 11.13.

Reply.

I am of your mind in all this: But withal, as *Acceptance* is the *most principal* act, and yet is a *fruit* of *Assent*: So *Affiance* may be a *principal act*, and yet be but a *fruit of Acceptance* or *Election*. And though [*believing in Christ*] imply *Affiance*, yet first it implieth *Assent* (of which *Downam* is large:) And though [*imbracing*] may include *Affiance*, yet first, and principally Acceptance, as is * evident.

* I should have said, that there is first Affiance on the Speakers Veracity in the Assent of Faith; and then a quieting Affiance in the Consent, when it is strong; and a practical Affiance, in venturing on the dangers and difficulties, and hoping for the reward.

Aphorism.

Page 291. I *Have earnestly sought the Lord's direction my knees, before I adventured on it.*

Animadverf.

That may argue the ſincerity of your deſire, but not the ſucceſs of your endeavours.

Reply.

Concedo totum. You need not deny a Concluſion that was never inferr'd. Whether I have any better Argument for my ſucceſs, I leave you to conclude upon peruſal.

Aphoriſm.

Ibid. *IF Faith juſtifie, as it is the fulfilling of the Condition of the New-Covenant, and Obedience be alſo part of that Condition; then Obedience muſt juſtifie in the ſame way as Faith.*

Animadverf.

But I think it neither hath been, nor can be proved, that either Faith doth juſtifie, as it is the fulfilling of the Condition of the whole New-Covenant, which doth comprehend more in it than Juſtification; or that *Obedience* is part of the Condition of the New-Covenant, ſo far as it concerns Juſtification, I mean for the obtaining of it. Obedience is required indeed in the New-Covenant; but not that thereby we may be juſtified, but as a fruit of that Faith whereby we are juſtified.

Reply.

The firſt is yielded. You might eaſily know, that I ſpoke of the Condition of Juſtification: For the ſecond, it is alſo granted of Juſtification begun: But as for Juſtification continued, and conſummate by Sentence at Judgment, let it reſt on the proofs themſelves.

Aphoriſm.

Page 292. *THE plain expreſſion of St.* James *ſhould terrifie us from an Interpretation contradictory to the Text: And except apparent violence*

violence be used with his Chap. 2. 21, 24, 25. *it cannot be doubted, but that a man is justified by* Works, *and not by* Faith *only.*

Animadvers.

It cannot indeed be doubted, but that St. *James* doth say so: But the Question is not of his words, but of his meaning. And it may seem strange, that you should so censure that Interpretation, which is generally received by Protestants, as to make it contradictory to the Text. The Papists say as much about those words, [*This is my Body*;] and they have as much reason for what they say as you have, for any thing I can see. For the meaning of St. *James*, whom you think to be so clear and full for you, it's needless to shew what our Divines do say, even *Cajetan* himself upon the place saith, *Jacobus docet quòd non fide sterili, sed fide fœcunda operibus Justificamur.* And this indeed seems to be S. *James*'s meaning by his whole Discourse, from *ver.* 14. to the end of the Chapter, where he bends himself against such as presume of Faith, though it be without Works, which Faith Protestants generally deny to be which justifieth. More especially consider, that St. *James* saith, *That* Abraham *was justified by works, when he had offered up his son upon the altar:* And that the Scripture was *fulfilled, which saith,* Abraham *believed God, and it was imputed to him for Righteousness,* v. 21, & 23. This clearly shews (methinks) that *Abraham* was only so justified by Works, and not by Faith only, as that he was justified, not by a barren and idle, but by a fruitful and working Faith, his Works shewed his Faith to be true justifying Faith indeed. For that [*Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for Righteousness,*] was said of him long before that he offered up *Isaac*, as the story in *Genesis* doth shew; and by those very words doth S. *Paul* prove that Justification is by Faith, and not by Works, *Rom.* 4. 3. Therefore when S. *James* saith, that by *Abraham*'s offering up of *Isaac*, that Scripture was fulfilled, I know not how it can be otherwise understood, than that thereby it did appear, that it was truly said of *Abraham, That he believed God,* &c. His willingness to obey God in so great a work, shewed that he believed indeed, and that his Faith was such, as whereby he was justified. So when St. *James* saith, That by Works *Abraham*'s Faith was made perfect; the meaning is, that his Works shewed his Faith to be perfect, that is, a true justifying Faith; even as God's strength is said to be made

perfect in our weakness, 2 *Cor.* 11. 9. *i.e* the greatness of his power is seen in our weakness: For it is certain, that our weakness can add nothing to God's power, though it may be an occasion to draw it out, and to make it manifest.

Reply.

1. I believe when the Holy Ghost speaks plainly, he means as he speaks.

2. I would you had told me what Interpretation is so generally received. Surely I have read of divers Interpretations by Protestants, one contradicting what others maintain; and therefore they do not so generally hold to one. Some say, It speaks of Justification *coram Deo*; some say, only *coram hominibus*; some, that it speaks of the Justification of the *person*; others, only of the Justification of his *Faith*, &c.

3. To your *Hoc est Corpus meum*, I answered before. It were an odd thing, if when we bring the express words of Scripture for any proof, it should be put off by *Hoc est Corpus meum*; or, *Ego sum Vitis*.

4. The words you cite, *vers.* 21, 23. will not prove what you intend. For if it be meant of [*Justification immediately on our first believing*,] or our *Justification as begun* (which you still insist on) then how can *James* prove by Works many years after, that the Faith was fruitful, when he was first justified by it.

5. Indeed the words you cite, undeniably prove that *James* and you speak not of one and the same Justification, or of Justification in the same sense. For you speak of it as *begun*, and *James* speaks of it only as *continued* (Legal Justification I mean) upon the performance of that Obedience which is the

secondary part of the Condition; and so he includeth also the Evangelical Justification, which I before described, as being the necessary *medium* for confirmation and continuation of the Legal. It is beyond doubt that *Abraham* was justified long before he offered up his Son. And this Work could be no Condition of that Justification which was past; and therefore *James* speaks not of that. And indeed how else could *James*'s Doctrine be reconciled with *Paul's*, or the truth, if it spoke of the *first*, or *begun Justification?* For that is before and without the very presence of all *external Works:* (you think, *before love to Christ*; and say, *All our Divines so hold:* and yet here you say, that Protestants generally deny that Faith which is *without Works* to justifie: But so do not I; therefore I give less to Works than you think Protestants do.) Except you will say (as *Grotius* doth, and I think in this truly) that *James* by Works means, *a disposition and resolution to obey*, as *still necessary* (implied in the taking Christ for King,) *and actual obedience when we are called to it.* For *Abraham* did not offer his son in Sacrifice, but by *attempting* it, and chearfully addressing himself to it, shewed his resolution to obey.

6. As for *Vers.* 23. which you urge, there is no necessity of your sense, nor is it much against what I say, if it be yielded. Either you think *James* by [*Fulfilled*] means, *quoad sensum verborum ut primò sunt enunciata:* (But that cannot be, because they were Historical, and therefore fulfilled as soon as spoken; and not Prophetical, to be fulfilled afterward:) Or else he useth the word *Fulfilled* less strictly, as referring to the Doctrine which that Historical Enunciation did contain, viz. [*That it*

was by believing God that Abraham *was justified*;] which (as *Grotius* truly notes) is ordinarily in the New-Testament the meaning of that word, [*That the Scripture may be fulfilled.*] And this must be the meaning here (for the Reason forementioned.) And then the sense may be, 1. Either by way of *Interpretation*; q.d. [*In this sense is this Scripture-Doctrine fulfilled,* Abraham *believed God, that is, He believed and obeyed also:*] Or it may be by way of *Concession*; q.d. [*Yet the Scripture was fulfilled, which saith,* Abraham *believed*, &c. For *Faith* did justifie him, but not *only Faith.*]

7. For your Interpretation of *Vers.* 22. it is only your Affirmation, and is as easily denied. Sure I am, that my Interpretation is true *quoad Doctrinam*, viz. That Faith is not only manifested perfect by Obedience, but that it is really perfected, 1. As the Tree is by bearing fruit. 2. As a Covenant or Promise is by performance (as a mans Bargain is perfected, when he hath done that which he thereby bound himself to do.) 3. As it hath *naturam medii, viz. Conditionis*, to the Continuation and Consummation of Justification. 4. As it is part of that necessary matter (not necessary at the first moment of believing, but necessary afterward, when he is called to it) whereby he is to be justified against the Charge of *non*-performance of the New-Covenants Condition; even against the Accusation of being an Unbeliever or Hypocrite. It cannot be denied, but thus far *following-Obedience perfecteth Faith:* And if this be true *doctrinally*, I see yet no reason, why I should exclude all these from the meaning of the Apostle in that Text, or any of them; when the old Rule is, to expound Scripture

ture in the most comprehensive sense it will bear, and not to limit or restrain it without necessity.

8. Your own Interpretation and Mr. *Pembles*, granteth as much as I plead for, I think, if you contradict not your self again: If by [*Works*,] you understand [*a working-Faith*,] it shall suffice me, if you apply it as *James* doth; that is, not to a mere *necessitas præsentiæ* of Works, but to that *Conducibility* to the effect, which *James* gives to both: Or (to speak as others) not only to *Faith in it self*, but to Faith *as working*. If [*a working Faith*] be made by God *the Condition* of *Justification*, then the *modus* or adjunct, [*Working*,] is a true, necessary, secondary part of the *Condition*, as the *Faith* it self is the substance or principal part. As when God makes [*sincere Faith*] the *Condition*, *Sincerity* is thereby made the *modus*, and so far a true part of the *Condition*. If you bargain to give me [*a sound, swift, travelling Horse*] on such a price: You receive your money for him as really *quatenus sound, swift*, &c. as *quatenus a Horse*. If a Woman in Marriage covenant to be [*a faithful Wife*,] (and *not adulterous*) she receives her interest in the Man and his Estate primarily *quatenus a Wife*, but also *quatenus faithful*; for want of which she may be divorced after. In this sense therefore I will not contend against you, if you yield, that *Faith* is the *Condition* of continued and consummate Justification; not only considered *in se* as *Faith*, but also as *working*. But still I say, I had rather stick to the Scripture-words, when I see no necessity to change them.

But now if Mr. *Pemble*, or you, or any, will say, [*Works justifie not the Person, but the Faith*,] you

say and unsay. It is a contradiction: For if it be true in all particular causes, that *Justificatio causæ est etiam Justificatio personæ* (as *Bradshaw* tells you more fully, *de Justif. Edit. Lat.* c. 3. §.9,10.p.30.) much more in such a Justification as this, which Everlasting Life dependeth on. If you be accused to be a final *non*-performer of the Conditions of the New-Covenant, he that justifieth your *performance*, justifieth *you* against *that Accusation*, and hath no other way to justifie you. This Accusation is, 1. Either that you are *an open Infidel:* Against this you must be justified, by producing *your Faith it self.* 2. Or that you are a *Hypocrite*; that is, a *close Unbeliever:* And so you must be justified *coram Deo*, by pleading the *sincerity* of your Faith, and *coram hominibus conjecturaliter*, by producing *Works* as the fruits. 3. Or that you are but a *half-Believer*, or *half-Performer* of the *Conditions*; viz. One that took Christ for your own ends to save you, but not to *rule you*, (Luke 19. 27.) or that believed (in *James*'s sense) but did not *obey:* Against this you must be justified by producing your *consent* to *Christ's Rule*, and your *Obedience.* (And to this *James* had respect.) Or, 4. You are accused to be an *Apostate:* And against this you must be justified, by producing your *Perseverance.* So that whatever part of the Condition you are accused to have violated, you must be justified, by proving the performance of that part. And this is *Justificatio personæ & non tantum causæ.* Nay, when you say, [*Works justifie our Faith,*] you plainly grant also, that they *justifie our Person*, when the case is, [*Whether we are true Believers or not?*] There is no way in this case (which will be the great case at the day of Judgment)

Judgment) to justifie the *Person*, but by justifying *his Faith*. And therefore I said, that I disliked not Mr. *Pembles* sense as to what he affirmed, [*That we are justified by a working Faith*:] But as to the denial or recalling of the same again, in saying, [*We are not justified by Works*;] or, [*They justifie not the Person, but his Faith:*] For if Faith justifie not, only considered as *Faith*, but also as *working*, that is plainly as much as to say, *Secondarily* we are justified by *Works*, or *Working*, as *primarily* by *Believing*; And that Works justifie us, by the justifying of our Faith. For the Apostle saying, [*We are justified by Works, and not by Faith only,*] doth as plainly as can be spoken, give Works more than a compresentiality, even a co-interest in the effect: For it cannot be said, [*We are justified by Works,*] because they are *present* only.

Aphorism.

Page 293. *THe Apostle doth professedly exclude the Works of the Law only from Justification, but never at all the Works of the Gospel, as they are the Conditions of the New-Covenant.*

Animadvers.

1. All Works, if they be Good-works, are Works of the Law, *i. e.* Works which the Law requireth; the Law (I mean the Moral Law) being as to Works the eternal Rule of Righteousness, there being no sin, but that which is forbidden by the Law, and which is a transgression of it, 1 *John* 3.4. And therefore that in the *Ephes.* 5. 15. *See that ye walk circumspectly*, or exactly, ἀκριβῶς, *Beza* doth well expound, *quam proximè ad Legis Dei præcepta.*

2. The Apostle doth simply and absolutely exclude Works from Justification: For, 1. He sheweth that *Abraham* was justified by Faith, and not by Works: Now *Abraham* did the Works of the Gospel, as well as of the Law, yet was he not justified

justified by Works, but by Faith only. 2. He sheweth, that if a man be justified by Works, of what kind soever, his Justification is not of Grace, but of Debt. 3. To prove that a man is justified by Faith, and not by Works, he alledgeth the words of *David*, *Blessed is the man whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin.* Now that must be understood of Works simply considered: For who doth any Works so, but that he hath need to have his iniquities forgiven, his sins covered, and not imputed to him? *Fraclare* Calvinus, (saith B. *Dav.* de Just. Act. c. 30. p. 394.) *seligat ex totâ suâ sanctus Dei servus, quod in ejus cursu maximè eximium se putabit edidisse, deprehendit alicubi quod carnis putredinem sapiat.*

Reply.

1. All Works are Works of *a Law*, but not [*the Law*] which the Apostle speaks of. The *Moral Law* distinct from the *Sanction* really, that is, as part of neither the Old-Covenant or New, is a *non ens*, a *Chymæra*.

2. To your Reasons, that the Apostle excludes *all Works* simply and absolutely: I answer particularly, 1. He speaks only of *Justification coram Deo Legislatore veteris Legis*; and not of Justification against the *Accusation of final Unbelief*. 2. He speaks of Justification against a *true Charge*, which is the same with *Remission of sin*; and not of Justification against a *false Accusation*. 3. He speaks of *Works*, as *Competitors with Christ*; and not as *subordinate to him*. (*James* contrarily.) For the Question that *Paul* debates is, Whether we are justified by the Works of the Law, or by the Righteousness of Christ received by Faith? Where he principally in his Question opposeth *Works* and *Christ* as in point of *Merit*; and Faith is but collaterally put in the opposition. 4. He speaks against

Works

Works justifying meritoriously, and not as *Conditions* of the *continuance* of a free-given Righteousness. This I could bring multitudes of our Divines that affirm, that the Apostle speaking against *Justification by Works*, means in point of *Merit*; and that this is the Controversie between us and the Papists. 5. He doth so usually add, [*The Works of the Law*,] as if he had foreseen this Controversie, and of purpose let them know, that it is not *Obedience to the Redeemer* that he *excludes* from justifying as a *Condition*, in subordination to Christ; but Works done in Opposition, Competition or Co-ordination with Christ. 6. He expresly speaketh only of those Works which make the *Reward to be of Debt, and not of Grace*, and of no other. So much in general to be premised.

Now particularly to your first Argument, I say 1. *Abraham's Gospel-works cannot* be set in competition with *Christ's Righteousness*, that is against their nature; and therefore could not so justifie: Which is all *Paul* says. But yet they might justifie as *Conditions under Christ*. 2. Your Conclusion unlimited, is expresly against the words of Scripture, *James* 2. 24.

To your second I answer, 1. There is no such words as yours, [*of what kind soever*,] either expressed or intimated by *Paul*. To *him that worketh*, in the sense *Paul* speaks of (that is, *ut operarius*, to have the wages for the worth of the work) *the Reward is not of Grace, but of Debt*. 2. Else you fully do feign it, to contradict the whole scope of the Scripture, that promiseth the Reward to the Obedient. For the Apostle there speaketh of [*Working*,] and not only trusting in them; and he speaketh of

the

the [*Reward*] and not only of *Justification* only. And do you think, that every man that obeyeth Christ, yea that obeyeth *præmii gratia*, doth ☞ make the Reward to be not of Grace? Then fair fall Antinomians and Rebels. 3. Faith is as truly a *Work*, as *Love* or *Hope*, &c. Yet it is not by *Paul* excluded; therefore not all *Works*.

I have followed this so far with another Reverend Brother, that I will say the less of it now. The two too common Answers are, 1. That this is *Bellarmine's* Answer; which I think not worthy a Reply. 2. That Faith justifies not as a Work, but as an Instrument. And so I say (more truly) Love, Hope, sincere Obedience, justifie not as Works, but as the Conditions on which God hath given the Confirmation, Continuation and Consummation of Justification. There is a third Answer of a Learned man, that *credere* is not *agere*, but *Pati*: But I think I have confuted that sufficiently.

3. To your third I say, 1. That plainly shews that *Paul* speaks only of the Justification I first mentioned. 2. We have need of pardon for the imperfection of Faith, Love, and every Work; therefore we have need to be justified *coram Deo Legislatore Legis operum*, by *Remission of sins* through the *Sacrifice of Christ*: This is all your words will conclude, or *Paul* intends; and this is easily granted, and I hope should be faithfully maintained against any Adversary, if there were occasion. But, 4. We need not pardon for performing the Conditions of the New-Covenant; not for *being Believers*, loving Christ, obeying, *&c.* but only for doing it *no better*. 5. If this be your Argument, [*Whatsoever Work is imperfect, and needeth pardon, cannot justifie*, &c.] I answer,

answer, By way of *Merit* it cannot: But as a *Condition* of *free-given Pardon*, an *imperfect* work may justifie; or else Faith could not. To *Calvin*'s words and *Davenants*, I willingly subscribe.

Aphorism.

Pag. 297. *For Mr.* Pemble's *Interpretation, that by* [Works,] *is meant* [*a working* Faith.] *I answer; I dare not teach the Holy Ghost to speak, nor force the Scripture, nor raise an Interpretation so far from the plain importance of the words*, &c.

Mr. *W. Thomas* Answer to *Speed*, saith not amiss, that [by *Faith we are justified*, as *sinners*; and by *Works* as *Believers*:] Though the matter require more for its Explication.

Animadverf.

1. All this is no more than the Papists object against the Exposition of those words, *This is my Body.*

2. That all this, or any part of it, doth follow on the admitting of Mr. *Pemble*'s Exposition (which as I have shewed, is no other than that which *Cajetan* doth imbrace) is only supposed, but not proved. We do not teach the Holy Ghost to speak, nor force Scripture, nor raise an Exposition far from the importance of the words, when we interpret Scripture by Scripture, and shew the meaning of one place by another, yea the meaning of a place by the very circumstances of it.

Reply.

It is not Mr. *Pemble*'s *inclusion*, but *exclusion*, that, as I shewed you, I speak of. And it is an ill way to interpret Scripture, by *denying* it: When you prove your Interpretation (in the point opposed) indeed by any other Scripture, or the circumstances of this, you will do more, I think, than I have yet seen done. But it is very easie to feign or suppose an Analysis according to our own conceit, and thence to force a sense on each particular Verse.

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *But when it is the very scope of a Chapter in plain and frequent Expressions, no whit dissonant from any other Scripture, I think he that may so wrest it, as to make it unsay what it saith, may as well make him a Creed of his own, let the Scripture say what it will to the contrary.*

Animadvers.

Still you suppose much, but prove nothing. I have shewed before, that the scope of the Chapter is not against Mr. *Pemble*'s Interpretation, but for it: And that to interpret as you do, is repugnant both to some passages in that Chapter, and also to other places of Scripture.

Reply.

1. Let your proofs prevail according to their strength: I leave it to the trial. 2. For my proofs, I know not well what to offer as such: For if I bring plain Scripture, it is easie to say, It means not as it speaks, and to feign an Analytical Reason of it. But I prove, that by [*Works*] *James* means [*Works*] indeed.

1. The unprofitableness of bare Faith, (that is, *Assent*) without *Works* (Works in a proper sense) is made the subject of his Discourse, *Vers.* 14. It is not *Faith* and *Faith* that are opposed, but *Faith alone*, and *Faith and Works*: Insomuch that he concludes, *Faith cannot save him that hath not Works*: Which plainly intimates a necessity of more in *Works* than their bare *presence*.

2. His first Argument *ab inefficacia similis*, is, *Good words*, without *good deeds* cannot feed or clothe men: So belief without a *good life*, cannot please God, and save the person, but as to *this use* is dead, being alone. Here again, the opposition is not merely

merely between Faith and Faith, but between *single Faith of Assent*, and *Faith and Works together*. And still the same kind of force (I am loth to call it efficacy) is ascribed to Works, in their place, as to Faith.

3. His second Argument is, That to have Faith without Works is a hardning of those that are Unbelievers, and causeth them to think ill of the Christian Faith, and insult over it, *vers.* 18. *q. d.* A man (that is, an Unbeliever) may say, *Thou hast Faith*, (*i. e.* You say none are of the true Religion but you; your Faith only is right, and we are all wrong; but *shew me thy Faith by thy Works*; (i.e. If your belief be so good, why have you no better lives? it appears by your Works, what your Belief is:) And *I will shew thee my Faith by my Works*; *i. e.* Let our Works shew which of us hath the best Belief.

4. His third Argument is, that the *Devils* have a true Belief without Works; therefore that will not save, *vers.* 19. *q. d.* Thou hast no more than Devils have, if this be all.

5. His fourth Argument is *vers.* 21. and the Conclusion premised, *vers.* 20. viz. *Faith without Works is dead*, viz. As to the *effect of justifying and saving* (*mortuum & inutile in Lege æquiparantur :*) Still here the opposite part on one side, is [*Faith and Works*;] and on the other [*Faith without Works.*] The Argument, *vers.* 21. is *Abraham* himself (that is said to be justified by Faith) was yet *justified by Works* (not only by that Faith which did work, but *by Works*) and the Work is expressed [*when he offered his son on the Altar.*]

In

In *Verſ.* 22. he urgeth the Application, *Seeſt thou not how Faith wrought with his Works*; i. e. He both believed and obeyed, his Faith and Obedience did co-work; or (if you will, that his Faith produced Works) and [*by Works was Faith made perfect*;] (*i. e.* by thoſe Works which it produced, or he added, Faith was made perfect for the accompliſhing of its ends, to which elſe it was dead, as is oft ſaid before: Perfect and Dead are oppoſed; Dead is inſufficient to the ends.)

6. In *verſ.* 23. he for preventing an Objection, [*Was not* Abraham *juſtified by Faith?*] interpreteth that ſaying, [*The Scripture was fulfilled which ſaith*, &c. (*q. d.* He was indeed juſtified by Faith, the Scripture is fulfilled in that: But when he was called to *Works*, it was not then by *Faith alone*, but by *Faith and Works* added (for though *Faith* be the *Condition of Initiation*, yet *Faith and Obedience*, of the *Confirmation*, *Continuation* and *Conſummation* of Righteouſneſs.)

7. In *Verſ.* 24. He very ſolemnly calls them to obſerve the Queſtion concluded from this Argument, [*You ſee then how that by Works a man is juſtified, and not by Faith only:*] Not by that *Faith* only which *did work*; but by *Works* (as he had oft ſaid before) *not Works* neceſſary *as ſigns*, or as *idle Concomitants*, but [*by Works he was juſtified:*] And leſt we ſhould doubt whether he only require their preſence, and not their conditional intereſt, he ſhews their intereſt to be of the ſame nature, though not of the ſame order and degree as Faith's intereſt is, by applying the word [*By*] to the ſeveral members [*By Works, and not only by Faith:*] And puts μόνον *ſolum*, leſt if he had put it *adjectively*, it might occaſion the contrary

trary Interpretation. And he saith not, [*Faith is justified,*] but [*a man is justified.*] So that they that say he speaks of the Justification of *Faith*, must make it run thus, [*You see that by Works a mans Faith is justified, and not by Faith only.*]

8. His fifth Argument he urgeth from the example of *Rahab*. *Rahab* was justified *by Works* (still retaining and inculcating the same words of being *justified by Works*, and not only by *the Faith* which produceth them; lest if he speak it but *once*, we might think it were not his *proper meaning*: And so expresseth the *particular Work* by which the Scripture commendeth *Rahab*, as being one of those Works that justifie her.

9. And so he concludeth again, *Vers.* 26. That as the *Body without the Spirit*, *so Faith* (i. e. *A sound Orthodox Belief*: For so our Divines against the Papists and Commentators usually interpret it) *without works* (to second it, and joyn with it, as part of the Condition of continued Justification and Salvation) is *dead also* (*i. e.* is *unprofitable.*)

I have laid by all Authors, and the remembrance of their judgments, as much as I could, and looked only on the words of the Text, and charged my Conscience to speak what seemed the true unforced Analysis: And this is it that seems to me to be the naked sense. But when I had done, and reviewed the sense of Expositors, I see no reason to change it.

Now if (as I have said) *Piscator*, *Pemble*, &c. by [*working Faith,*] mean not only [*Faith it self as Faith,*] but [*Faith as working,*] i. e. *first as Faith, and secondarily as Working*, they say as much as I (but yet I will not accuse or refuse this oft repeated

Scripture-phrase: But if they mean by [*working Faith*,] only [*that Faith which hath Works as only* quoad præsentiam *necessary*, and not at all *ad effectum Justificationis*,] I think they utterly forsake plain Scripture-words and sense.

Aphorism.

Page 299. *They think that Faith is an instrumental efficient Cause of our Justification (which that properly it is not I have proved before) when if they understood that it justifieth but as* à causa sine qua non, *or Condition, they would easily yield that Works do so too.*

Animadvers.

1. Do you think that neither Mr. *Pemble*, nor *Calvin*, nor any of all those eminent Divines whom you oppose, did unstand the nature and use of Faith in the point of Justification?

2. Let Faith be either an Instrument, as many term it (and I have before noted the reason, as I conceive it:) or a Condition, as *you will have it* (*and I am not against it*) yet Faith doth justifie as it apprehendeth Christ's Satisfaction; by which indeed so apprehended, we are justified. Works do not concur with Faith in this act of apprehending Christ's Satisfaction; and therefore neither are they concurrent unto Justification.

Reply.

1. I confess you have me now at a disadvantage. I shall not easily rid my hands of this Platonick Argument, though the Logick of it may be well enough dealt with. If I say that *Calvin*, &c. knew not so much as I, it will seem Arrogancy: If I say they did know more in this, I seem to confess my self to err. But what if I speak freely what I think without dissembling, let it seem what it will? I think for the service *Calvin* and such others did the Church, and for the progress that Truth made by their

their endeavours, it was such, that I deserve not to be named the same day with them: I think also that *Calvin* brought in more New-Doctrines (new to those times) than I have done incomparably: I think also that he writes so moderately oft of this very point, that I think his judgment was in sense, in the main, the same with mine. Yet I think his apprehensions of the Doctrines now in dispute, and his expressions of them, were not so clear, distinct and orderly, but that some that come after may see further, and redress those oversights, which have occasioned quarrels since (when, as Dr. *Stoughton* saith, *We differ but in words about Justification by Faith, not understanding each others meaning. Form of wholesom words.*) And I will not be so ungrateful to God, for fear of seeming arrogant, as not to speak plainly, that I hope God hath shewed me somewhat further in this point, and some others, than *Calvin* hath taught or discovered. (And yet I think few of his *nearer* followers saw so much as he; but *most* depraved his Doctrine by out-going him, while they thought they did but imitate or vindicate him.) I hope when the Master-workman hath built the House, his Boy may say, without the imputation of Arrogancy, I have driven two or three pins which my Master oversaw.

But if this free Answer will not serve, I will answer as I have learned: I also will ask of you a Question or two. And when you have answered me, I will answer you.

1. Do you think that neither *Clem. Roman. Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Clem. Alexand. Tatianus, Athenagoras, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, Lactantius, Cyril*, &c. nor any one Divine for a thousand

years after *Paul*, did understand his Doctrine, or know how Faith justified, or how far Works did concur? And you cannot but know (that are a man of reading) that they give generally as much, and mostly more to Works than ever I did, and that they teach our Justification by Faith to be as by Condition, and not as by an Instrument (whatever forced scraps some may gather out of a line, against the full scope of the whole page or Book.)

2. Do you think that *Calvin*, *Martyr*, *Chamier*, &c. with the stream of great renowned Forreign Divines (specially the first Reformers) did none of them know *what justifying Faith was?* that which we think our Children should know by their Catechism? which we think is so near the foundation? And yet did these men take justifying Faith to be either *Assurance* or *Perswasion* of the *pardon of a mans own sins in particular*; and say, He that had not this *Certainty* or *Perswasion*, had no Faith; and even lay a mighty part of Doctrinal Reformation, and difference between us and the Papists in this? And yet almost all our English Divines (except Antinomians) and most others, do now generally disclaim that Doctrine as erroneous, and place justifying Faith in Affiance, Recumbency, Assent or Acceptance, &c. confessing that *Assurance*, yea, and that *perswasion*, to be a separable fruit. Was it the former or the present Divines that knew not what justifying Faith is? Indeed if this way of arguing were good, you might save all your other Arguments through your whole Animadversions, and carry all with this one Question: [Do you think I understand not the nature and use of Faith in Justification?] For I reverence your under-

understanding as much as some of theirs at least.

2. But your next words indeed concern the heart of our Controversie; and if I mistake not, do discover the main part of your mistake, and withal do contradict themselves.

You grant that Faith is a *Condition*, and (elsewhere) that it justifieth *as a Condition*; yet you say, it Justifieth, as it *apprehendeth Christ's Satisfaction*, by which indeed so apprehended, we are justified. But,

1. If by [*Apprehending*,] you mean [*Acceptance*,] and not mere *Assent* to the truth of the Gospel revealing Christ's Satisfaction, I then say, that this is a very great mistake: For it is *Christ himself*, and not his *Satisfaction*, that is the *adequate Object* of the *compleat act* of *justifying Faith*, that is, the *Wills act*: It is *Christ himself* that is *offered to us* to be our *Head*, *Husband*, *Lord*, *Saviour*, and by *accepting him*, the *Covenant* is made, and we are *united to him*: And this *Union* is the first effect of *this Faith*, and then *Justification* in order of nature follows as a *benefit*: As the Honours and Dowry go with the person in Marriage. Not that there needs another act of Faith to *justifie us*, after that the first hath *united us* to Christ. No: It is one act of Faith which is *uniting*, *justifying*, *adopting*, &c. they are several *relative effects* resulting from the *Covenant-grant*, upon our *first believing* (which is the *Condition.*) It is to *God* that Christ's *Satisfaction* is *given*, and to us *Christ himself*, and the *fruits* of it: It is too grosse a conceit, that only the *apprehension* of Satisfaction it self, or *Righteousness* either, should be the *justifying Act*: As if you should say, *A Woman's apprehension* of her *Husbands Riches*, is it that

makes her *rich*, when it is her *Consent* to have the *man*. And a dangerous Doctrine this is to be preached to our sensual people, who are contented to have *Christ's Satisfaction* (as you speak) or *Righteousness*, but not himself in the state he is offered: This turns mens thoughts from Christ himself, with whom they must first close in Marriage-Covenant, before they shall have any Righteousness by his Satisfaction.

2. You seem to conceive that Faith justifieth *modo Physico, & non Politico vel Morali*: That as a man that takes money in his hand, doth thereby *physically receive* it, so he that takes Christ's Satisfaction or Righteousness, doth physically receive it. Which is too gross. For; 1. The Question is of our obtaining *Right*, and not *Possession*: And no *physical Apprehension* as such, gives *Right*. 2. *Recipere est pati, sed credere est agere; ergo credere est tantum receptio imputativa.* 3. Christ's *Satisfaction* or Righteousness is not an Object capable of our physical Reception. 4. Yet a *physical Reception* of *Righteousness* there is, imperfectly called so, even as all *Relations* are *received*; and which is nothing but *Justificari*, Passive Justification: But this follows Faith. *Credere & Justificari non sunt idem. Credimus enim ad Justificationem.*

3. The Controversie between us must lie here Whether the *formalis vel proxima ratio* of Faith's interest in our Justification, be its *Apprehensive Nature*, or *its Office of Conditionality?* The *Nature* of Faith it self? or that it is the *Condition* to which the free Donor hath annexed Justification? For *Apprehendere Christum* I confess to be the *Nature* of Faith. Now I say (and say more confidently than ever, having tried the strength of many against it

tha

that *Apprehendere vel Acceptare Christum* being *ipsa fidei essentia*, is but the *matter* that hath interest, and not the *ratio formalis* of *Faith's interest* in our *Justification*. It is but the *aptitudo ad officium*, and the *Conditionality* (if I may so call it) is the *Office* it self. *That Faith* which doth *accept Christ*, doth justifie, and *materialiter thereby*: But not *as it acceptеth Christ*. The word [*As, quatenus*] should strictly speak only the *formal Reason*: And so Faith justifieth only as *a Condition*, appointed thereto by God. But if any should extend it improperly to the *ratio aptitudinalis*, then I would yield to them, that Faith justifies as it accepteth Christ. For no other way of Participation was so fitted to the nature of the *Recipient* and *Receptum*.

1. The *Nature* of Faith it self (which is *acceptare Christum*) goes in order of Nature *before* its *Conditionality*: It is therefore apparent, that the act is but the *materia apta*, and the *Conditionality* is the superadded *formalis ratio*.

2. If *Faith as Faith*, justifie, that is, as *acceptatio Christi*, then *omnis acceptatio*, *& sola*, *& semper*; then the Consequence would proceed directly and necessarily *ex se* [*I have accepted Christ, therefore I am justified*:] But that it will not do. For, 1. He is ours, as *given* directly; that is, the efficient cause of our right to him. Had we taken him, or performed that same act which we call Apprehension without *Gift*, it had conveyed no right. 2. And (if you say, that, at least, *omnis apprehensio Christi dati* doth justifie *qua apprehensio*;) I must add, That if Christ had been given by an *absolute Promise* or *Gift*, our apprehension of him would not have justified; but we should have been justified *before* it,

or *without* it. As if a man by Testament give his Lands to his Son that is a thousand miles distant, and knows nothing of it, the right is his before his knowledg or consent, though he may afterward dispossess himself of it when he will. If a King will confer any Honour on a man absent, or an Infant, he may do it, and they partake of the Honour, without their own knowledg or consent. And when they do *know* and *consent*, that gives not the Honour or Title which they had before. If God had pleased to say, [I will give my Son and his Righteousness to such *Infants*, *Ideots*, *Indians*, though they never hear of him; or absolutely to say, [*I will pardon all their sins*,] they had been justified and pardoned thereby without Faith: If the Promise were not *conditional* (expresly or implicitely) no mans Faith could justifie him. As it belongeth to the *Legislator per præceptum constituere Debitum officii*, and without Precept (natural or superadded) duty, would be no duty: So it belongs to the *Legislator* or *Donor*, as *Dominus præmii* (and in our case *Dominus præmiati*) to institute the *Conditions* on which it shall be obtained; and therefore it is not from the *essential nature* of the *act of Faith* it self. The benefit to be received was wholly God's before the giving; therefore it cannot be conveyed any way, but by the mere signification of God's will: What way is then to alienate a Propriety freely, or to confer right to a benefit on another, but by signifying the Donors will? that is, by giving, selling, *&c.* Now therefore no act of ours can confer to us the right to anothers benefits; that were to give them to our selves before we have them. All that our act can do, is to be the *Condition* of the Gift; that is, an

act

act which it pleaseth the Donor so to require of us, if we will have his Gift, that he will suspend his Donation thereon; so that when we perform it, we shall have it, and not without it. Seeing therefore that the Will of the Donor as Donor, doth all in Alienation of his own, or in conveying right to his benefits; therefore no act of the Receivers as an act, or such an act directly, can do it: For from his Will must the Receivers act have its most immediate formal interest: Now the *Natura fidei apprehensiva*, is not from God as *Legislator* of the *New-Law* or *Testament*, and as *Donor of Christ* and *Justification*; but from God as *Creator* or *Producer* of that *Act in the Soul*, or by it. But the constituting the *Condition* is *God's act as Donor* of that very *Benefit*, or as *Legislator*. That which I mainly therefore insist on is this: Call Faith an Instrument, or an Apprehension, or what you will; as long as you mean but the *nature of the Act or Habit*, it doth not *justifie propriè & proximè qua talis*, that is, but the *materia apta*; but the *formalis ratio* of its justifying interest, is *quâ conditio fœderis*: And therefore whatsoever is such a Condition of Justification doth justifie.

One while the Condition was not the same as now it is, and yet it then justified. The World before Christ was not bound to believe that this Jesus was the Christ, that he was born of a Virgin, crucified, dead, buried, risen, *&c.* but only that Christ who should come, should do thus (and it may seem that the Disciples before Christ's Resurrection, believed not that neither:) But if we believe not that this Jesus is he, we shall die in our sins. Faith cannot therefore justifie *proximè & formaliter ex natura actus*,

actus, when it hath been so changed; and yet whatsoever was the Condition, still justified.

Besides, you contradict this your self, by acknowledging that Faith justifieth *as a Condition* of *Justification*. For then certainly it cannot justifie *proximè*, as it is *apprehensio*, that is, *qua fides*. For, 1. The *Conditionality* cannot be the *matter* and the *nature* of the Act, the super-added *form*, but contrary. For the *Conditionality* supposeth the *nature* of the Act, and not, the nature of the Act supposes it to be the Condition. 2. It is not possible that both should be *proximæ vel formalis rationes*: It must be but one. 3. It is impossible, if Faith be a *Condition*, but that it should justifie *quâ conditio*; and it is impossible, if it justifie *as a Condition*, but that should be its neareſt Reason. To say, [the Sun is *causa efficiens* of *Light*, and yet that it produceth not Light *qua causa efficiens*, or yet that there is some nearer Reason; were not so absurd as to say, *Faith is a Condition*, and yet either justifieth not *quâ conditio*, or yet hath some more formal Reason. But I have by so many Arguments lately to another Brother, confuted this Opinion, [that Faith justifies *ex natura actus*, viz. *ut apprehensio Christi, vel ut fides, & ut conditio naturalis, & non ut conditio moralis*] that I must now thus dismiss it.

If you say, that you do not mean, that *Faith as Faith*, or *ex natura actus* justifieth, but *ex natura objecti*. I answer, 1. Our Question is not, Whether Christ justifie? if that be it, we are agreed: I do not think when you say, Faith is an Apprehension of *Christ*, or a *Condition*, that you mean [Christ *justifies as an Apprehension of Christ, or a Condition:*] The Question is therefore of *Faith's* interest, and not

not of *Christ's*. 2. The Object gives not a justifying force to the act. 3. The root still of all the mistakes lieth, in having thoughts of this moral Conveyance of Right, as if it were a physical Communication of some Substance or Quality. The receiving of fire burns my hand *ex naturâ objecti*, and my act of Approximation, or taking it into my hand, is *conditio naturalis (impropriè dicta conditio:)* But in conveying Rights (as in Marriage, Testaments, and all Contracts, *&c.*) the *Right* must be first conveyed by *moral means*, before the *Object* can put forth its power. Christ is not yours, because he is Christ, nor yours because you apprehend him (speaking of the neareſt Reason;) but yours, because God hath *given him*; and yours upon *believing*, rather than on any other terms, because God hath given him to you, *if you believe*, rather than on other terms. If God had said, some other act should be the Condition, it should have justified, as truly Faith now doth.

And therefore for your Argument, [*Works concur not with Faith in apprehending, therefore neither in justifying.*] I deny your Consequence, having first denied your ground: For, *fides non quà fides justificat, sed quà conditio præstita.* And I argue contrarily, Repentance and Obedience to the Lord that bought us, do concur with Faith in being *Conditions* of continued and consummate Justification; therefore they concur in justifying. (Yet I had rather say, [*We are justified by Faith,*] as signifying only a Conditionality, and being a Scripture-phase; than that [*Faith justifieth,*] as importing more a *Causality*, and being no *Scripture-phrase.*)

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Page 300. *When it is said, that we are justified by Works, the word* [By] *implieth more than an idle Concomitancy: If they only stood by while Faith doth all, it could not be said, that we are justified by Works.*

Animadvers.

1. All this proves not, that by *Works* in St. *James*, is not meant [*a working Faith.*] Or that when he saith, that a man is justified by Works, and not by Faith only, his meaning is not, that a man is justified by such a Faith, as doth shew forth it self by Works, and not by a barren Faith, which hath no Works flowing from it.

2. [Faith alone (*saith Dr.* Preston) justifieth, but it is effectual and working Faith, and Works follow Faith necessarily. And there is a double Justification: One of the person, which is by Faith only, whereof St. *Paul* disputes, *Rom.* 4. the other of the Faith, which by Works must be shewed to be lively and effectual, as St. *James* disputes, *chap.* 2. Works justified *Abraham* that he was no Hypocrite (*i. e.* they shewed his Faith to be unfeigned, as the Apostle sheweth Faith must be, 1. *Tim.* 1. 5.) and Faith, that he was not a sinner, because by Faith Righteousness was imputed to him.] So he.

Reply.

1. No wonder: for it is brought to another end, than to prove that by Works, is meant Works.

2. What will you take for proof? If I should find the most expres words for it, I think they may have another sense put on them as fairly as these.

3. I think the proof lieth on your part (which I see not performed:) For if I shew you where the Scripture saith, [*We are justified by Works, and not by Faith only:*] If you say, by *Works* is not meant *Works*, you must prove it. Because the plain sense is not to be forsaken without *cause*; and therefore he that doth it, must shew good cause for it.

4. But

4. But yet I will tell you what goes with me for proof (that by Works is meant *Works*, and not only the *Faith* which *doth work*) till I hear better proof of the contrary.

1. *James* calls them by the name of [*Works*] *twelve times* in thirteen Verses, and never by the name of [*working Faith*,] or, [*that Faith which worketh:*] A repetition not usual in Scripture, specially on such a subject: As if he had purposely done it to make men believe, that he means as he speaks; and therefore I think by [*Works*] he means [*Works.*] For obscure figurative speeches are usually but seldom, in comparison of the plain ones, and sufficiently evinced to be such by the more plain.

2. I am yet the more perswaded, that by [*Works*] is meant [*Works,*] because it is still opposed to [*Faith without Works,*] or, [*Faith alone,*] and not to [*this or that sort of Faith, viz.* that Faith which is not of a quality to Work,] though I doubt not but that is part of the Apostle's sense, in this term [*Faith,*] yet it is but part: For it is not only [*the Faith alone, without a working disposition,*] but [*Faith alone without Works themselves,*] when there is opportunity: The word [*Alone*] excluding Works themselves, as well as the *working disposition.* So that if I will wrest the word [*Works*] twelve times together to a strange sense, I must needs use the same violence with the word [*Faith alone*] also. Should I again run over each Verse, it is easie to manifest, that the opposition is not only between [*a Faith disposed to Work*, and a *Faith not disposed*;] but between [*Faith alone,*] and [*Faith and Works themselves together:*] Though yet the *conatus*

is

is the *work*, where no more is required, as in *Abraham*'s case.

3. Particularly the Argument *à simili*, in *v.* 15,16. proves it: For the Argument is, *As merciful words do not profit the naked and hungry without clothes and food, so a good Belief will not justifie and save you, without Works.* Now it is not a *disposition* to *feed* and *clothe* that profiteth the hungry and naked: So neither is it a mere *disposition* to work, that is meant by Works.

4. The same is manifest in *Vers.* 13. where the occasion of all this discourse is begun, in the necessity of mercy, such mercy as men partake of from us.

5. I am the more confirmed, when I consider, that the death of Faith without Works here, *v.*20, 14, 26,24. is not merely the hypocrisie or seemingness of it: (He likeneth it to the real Faith of the Devils,) but the *inutility* of it as to justifie and save; (for justifying and saving Faith are all one with *James*, vers. 14,21,24.)

6. And *Vers.*18. by [*Works*] must needs be meant [*Works*;] else it would run thus, [*Thou hast Faith undisposed to Work, and I have a working Faith: Shew me thy non-working Faith without thy working Faith, and I will shew thee my working Faith by my working Faith.*] I had rather understand *James* plainly, than take him to speak such non-sense: And if you will take *Faith* and *Works* in the plain proper sense in this Verse, why not in the rest?

7. And in *Vers.* 20. *Works* must needs mean *Works*; else it must run thus, [*Faith without a working Faith is dead.*]

8. And

8. And so must it be *Vers.* 22. else it must run thus, [*Faith wrought with his working Faith, and by a working Faith was Faith made perfect,*] nay, [*a non-working Faith was made perfect.*]

9. So *Vers.* 24. else it must be thus, [*By a working Faith a man is justified, and not by a non-working Faith only:*] As if a *non-working* Faith did partly justifie. (For I hope you will not turn *solum* to *solam.*)

10. So *Ver.* 26. according to your way it must run, [*So a non-working Faith, without a working Faith is dead also.*] Let him that can, receive this Exposition, for I cannot.

11. But my chief Argument lieth in the great necessity of Works which the Apostle asserteth, both to Justification and Salvation. Now if I meet with those that confess by *Works* is meant *Works*, I would desire to know the reason, Why Works with Faith are so necessary? If they do but by an idle Concomitancy stand by, what means *James* to say, *Can Faith save him? we are justified by Works: What profit*, &c. So I would demand of you, concerning the *working* of *Faith*. If you understand [*working Faith,*] so as to make *Faith* it self the primary part of the Condition, and *working* the secondary, then you yield all I desire: If you understand it so, as to confine it to [*the Faith which worketh,*] and exclude [*the Working*] from justifying and saving (for *James* joyns both together) then will you open this mystery to me, and tell me, whence or what is this necessity that Faith should be working? If you say, *Working is necessary to signifie Faith to be sincere.* I reply, 1. But the Apostle makes it necessary to *justifie* and *save*, and not only to *signifie*. The Soul

Soul doth not only *signifie* the Body to be alive. 2. God needs no signs, and it is he that judgeth.

You will say, *It is not sincere without working.*

Reply. 1. It is a *real Faith*, such as the Devils have, nay it may be more, they may really consent, that Christ shall justifie and save them from Hell.

2. How comes its Sincerity to lie in its working Disposition? The sincerity of Faith as a good Work, lieth in its conformity to the Precept: But that's not the Sincerity in question. The sincerity of Faith, as *justifying* and *saving*, lieth in its being really that Faith, to which as a Condition, Justification and Salvation are promised. Now if the New-Testament make not mere Faith, but *Faith working*, to be the *Condition* of Justification or Salvation, then Faith *as* working secondarily, must justifie and save. For if in any Covenant there be *an Act* with its *Qualification* required, as the *Condition*, then the *Qualification* is part of that *Condition* as well as the *Act*: For it hath the same *essence* herein. And to say, that working is part of the *Condition* of Justification and Salvation, and yet doth not *justifie* and *save quà conditio*, is a contradiction directly: As much as to say, It is a Condition, and not a Condition; for the form of the Condition, is in its connexive respect to the effect. As if you should say, [Such a thing is a cause efficient, but doth not *quâ causa* produce the *effect*.]

If not only *fides qua fides*, but *qua operans*, be *necessary* to Justification and Salvation, then it must be necessary either as *a cause* (but that we all deny) or as a *mere sign*; (but that it cannot be, when it is *coram Deo*: and more is expressed fully in the Text) or else as *a Condition* (which is the truth, it is past my

my reach to find any other respect wherein its necessity should lie. Let them shew it that assert it.

As for them that say, It is but the *Declaration* of our Justification *before men*, that is here spoken of, and not *before God*; 1. I have said enough to them in that Aphorism. 2. I need not meddle with that to you, who own it not. 3. The same instances of *Abraham* and *Rahab* are produced, by which other Scriptures prove Justification by Faith before God. 4. The Justification here meant, is an Imputation of Righteousness, *vers.* 23. and that is by God, and *coram Deo*. 5. *Abraham*'s sacrificing his Son, would rather have *condemned* him *before men*. 6. It is such as the Scripture about Imputation was *fulfilled* in. 7. It is the same Justification as that by Faith is: For the Apostle saith, [*It is by Works, and not by Faith only,*] importing, it is *by Faith*, but not only by Faith. Now *coram hominibus* it is not by Faith it self at all (indeed by the *profession* of Faith it may be.) 8. The Apostle makes Faith without Works unprofitable *to save*, vers. 14. And is it before men, or by men only, that they *are saved?* 9. Men know not when we *work* from *sincere Faith*, and when not. 10. Men be none of our *Judges*, nor doth the Apostle discourse of so small a matter as our being judged by man: And yet this is the commonest Exposition. Thus I have told you, why I think by Works is meant *Works*: and why they justifie, and that *coram Deo*.

2. Now to Dr. *Prestons* saying, which I marvel that you could produce against your self so fully, and take no notice of it. Though I believe Dr. *Prestons* Notions were not so digested as they should be in the point of Justification, yet they were so clear

the nature of *justifying Faith* (above any man that I know of) that it hath maintained much soundness in his Doctrine in the point of Justification in most things (only the notion of an *Instrument* was not then questioned:) and therefore if you go once to Dr. *Preston*, I know where your cause is. It seems you could not pick one saying out of him seeming for you, but what saith almost as much against you as I do. 1. I say as he, that *Faith alone justifieth*, speaking of our *first*, or *begun Justification*, which makes a man *justum ex injusto* (that *Works* never do.) 2. I say *Works follow Faith* necessarily. 3. This *twofold Justification* I maintain against you, which Dr. *Preston* here maintaineth. 4. In the common sense it may be said, that one is *more fully Justificatio personæ* than the other: But then remember, 1. That both are yet most truly and properly *Justificationes personæ*, as *Bradshaw* shews in the place before-cited. 2. And that Dr. *Preston* confesseth it: For when he hath said, that one is [*of the Faith,*] he yet adds, [*Works justified* Abraham *that he was no Hypocrite.*] *Sin* is it that is enquired after at the Bar of *the Law:* Only *one kind of sin* is enquired after (as to *Condemnation*) at the Bar of the *New-Law*; that is, *Unbelief*, or *rejecting* the *Redeemer*, and recovering Grace. This *Unbelief* is either *open* (against the Accusation of this, men are justified by Faith and Profession; or *secret* (which is the Hypocrisie here mentioned) and against this Accusation both *Faith* and *Works* justifie: (Of which I spoke fullier before.) When *Abraham* is accused of being but a *seeming* Believer, or a *mere Believer* without *Obedience*; and so, either of *not-performing*, or but *half-performing* the Condition of the New-

New-Covenant: Here there is no way in the World to justifie him, but by his *own Faith and Works*. I shall speak more of this yet anon.

Aphorism.

Page 300. *When the Apostle saith,* [by Works, and not by Faith only,] *he plainly makes them Concomitant in Procurement, or in that kind of Causality which they have: Specially seeing he saith, not as he is commonly interpreted,* [not by Faith which is alone,] but, [*not by Faith only.*]

Animadverf.

The Apostle cannot make Faith and Works concomitant in Procurement of Justification, seeing that *Abraham* was justified by Faith, as the Scripture cited by the Apostle doth shew long before, that his Faith did operate and shew forth it self by that Work which the Apostle mentioneth: Therefore by Works, and not by Faith only, must needs be as much, as [*not by Faith which is alone without Works:*] Which is also clear enough by the whole Series of the latter part of the Chapter, and namely by that, Vers. 17. *Even so Faith, if it hath not Works is dead, being alone.*

Reply.

I will not forsake the plain sense of the Text, till other kind of Arguments than these constrain me. 1. Do not you easily see, that your necessary Consequence is against your self and the truth, more than me, and hath indeed no necessity or verity. You speak of *Abraham's first Justification*, and yet you say, it must needs be *by Faith, which is not alone without Works*. But *Abraham's first Justification was by Faith alone without Works*. 2. Do not you see that you argue to no purpose, that [the Apostle cannot make Faith and Works concomitant in procurement of Justification, as continued and consummate, and sentential at Judgment, because *Abraham* was justified

before?] But was his *continued* and *ſentential* Juſtification before? The Law doth ſtill *moraliter agere*, and ſo ſtill *Juſtificare*, and ſo doth God by his Law or Grant. So that it being *actus Legis*, the Law doth as properly juſtifie you *to day*, as it did the *firſt day*. And yet it requires *more Conditions* at your hand *to day*, than the firſt moment. I wait therefore for ſome proof of your Conſequence, That *Abraham*'s Juſtification twenty years after his Converſion, cannot be by Works as part of the Condition of Continuance, becauſe his Juſtification was begun without Works. 3. For your clear proof from the Series and *Verſ.* 17. I ſee not the leaſt ſhew of proof, much leſs clear, but againſt you.

Aphoriſm.

Ibid. HE *therefore ſaith*, [Faith is dead, being alone,] *becauſe it is dead as to the uſe and purpoſe of juſtifying* —— *And ſo Works make Faith alive, as to the Attainment of its ends of Juſtification.*

Animadverſ.

1. Faith if it be alone without Works (*hoc eſt renuens operari*, as *Cajetan* doth well expreſs it,) cannot juſtifie, and ſo is dead as to the uſe and purpoſe of juſtifying. Yet do not Works therefore concur with Faith to Juſtification, nor are they *part* of the *Condition* required of us, that we may be juſtified.

2. Works do not properly *make* Faith alive, but only demonſtrate it to be alive. Works are the effect of juſtifying Faith, and the effect cannot give life to the cauſe, but may evidence the life of it.

Reply.

1. You yield to my Expoſition of [*Dead*;] viz. *non ut fides, ſed ut medium*, that Works are part of the Condition; I doubt not to ſay, the Scriptures cited in the Aphoriſm fully prove.

2. You

2. You must know that those words were mis-written, or misprinted: They should be thus, [*And without Works, Faith is not alive*;] yet the words are true as they are. For by [*Faith*] I mean not, [*fidem qua fides*,] Works do not make Faith alive in it self; but, [*fidem qua medium*:] And by [*Making alive*,] I mean not *efficienter*, but *constitutivè*. And so when a man hath a *Condition* to perform which hath two parts, when the first is performed, the performance of the second part makes it to be sufficient to the end; it makes it to be the *totum*, the Condition fully performed, and so alive or sufficient *ut medium*: When without it, it would be but *pars*, and insufficient.

3. To your Argument I grant all, and what the better are you? Works are the effect of Faith, and so they neither give life to Faith as Faith, nor to Faith as the cause of Works, nor yet to Faith as the Condition of our begun-Justification (because so Faith is the whole Condition, as to external Works, though not as to the exclusion of Repentance, Knowledg or Love;) but as it is the *medium* or *Condition* of our *confirmed*, *continued*, *consummate Justification*. Your *Fine* is the full Condition of first possessing a leased Tenement, but your *Rent* must be added to *continue* your Interest and Possession (yet in our Case there is no *ratio pretii*.)

Aphorism.

Page 301. *When the Apostle saith, That Faith did work in and with his Works, it clearly aimeth at such a working in and with us, as maketh them conjunct in the Work of justifying.*

Animadverſ.

1. Why you render συνεργεῖν to work in and with I know not, it ſignifieth only to work with.

2. The meaning of thoſe words cannot be, that Faith and Works work together unto Juſtification, or are conjunct (as you ſay) in the work of juſtifying; ſeeing the work there ſpecified, (viz. *Abrahams* offering of his Son) was long after Juſtification, which Faith alone had procured. I ſee no Reaſon therefore to diſlike *Calvin*'s Expoſition, *Fides dicitur co-operata fuiſſe operibus, quia non fuit otioſa.*

Reply.

1. I uſed thoſe words not as a mere Tranſlation, but as the Tranſlation [working with] & the Expoſition; as ſuppoſing that Faith was ſaid to work with Works, when it produced them, and ſo work'd in them; and ſo conſequently I thought they concurred to juſtifie, according to the next words, [*By Works Faith is made perfect.*] But ſeeing this Expoſition pleaſeth not (though it makes as much for you as your own) I let it go, and will not inſiſt on it.

2. I have ſhewed the invalidity of your Conſequence before, that [Faith and Works cannot concur to continued and conſummate Juſtification, becauſe we were at firſt juſtified by Faith alone.] When will you ſhew a word of Reaſon for that Conſequence?

3. For *Calvin*'s Expoſition: As you ſeem not to own it in the main, *viz.* [*That it is not Juſtification* coram Deo, *but* coram Hominibus *that is here meant:*] So I ſtick not much at this, though I think it very imperfect to ſay, that Faith is ſaid to *co-operate*, becauſe it is *not idle.* It might indeed be well ſaid to *operate*, becauſe it is not idle, or rather not to be idle, becauſe it worketh.

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *And when he saith,* [*That Faith was made perfect by Works,*] *it is not* (*as they and others interpret it*) *only a manifesting to be perfect: But as the Habit is perfected in its acts, because they are the end to which it tendeth; and as Marriage is perfected* per congressum & procreationem, *or any Covenant when the Conditions are performed.*

Animadvers.

Piscator and *Pemble*, and others say, *It is*: You say, *It is not*: But their [*Yea,*] may stand against your [*Nay,*] for any thing I yet see. Their Exposition is for phrase agreeable to Scripture elsewhere, *viz.* 2 *Cor.* 12. 9. and for matter to the Context.

3. The habit of Faith hath no other immediate and elicit acts (that I know) besides believing; and by believing we are justified, though not as it is our act, but in respect of its Object, Christ, whom Faith apprehendeth, and by whom so apprehended we are justified. Other Works proceed from Faith as the fruits of it, but they perfect Faith no otherwise, than by manifesting the perfection of it; even as the fruit of a tree doth manifest, but not make the tree perfect. *Faith* (saith Dr. *Preston*) *is made perfect by Works*; *namely, as an Artist is declared skilful by his artificial Work, or a tree by the fruit it bears*; *the sap is the cause of the Goodness, the fruit the sign.*

3. Marriage is a state, which is consummated *per congressum*, though there never be *pro creatio*: But what this makes for the illustrating of Faith's being made perfect by Works, I do not see.

4. Faith is not the Covenant, but a Condition of the Covenant, and therefore your last similitude seems not *quadrare.*

Reply.

1. I magnifie their authority and worth: But whose Reasons have more weight, I leave to others to judge as they see cause.

2. Your self yield before, that it is *quoad usum & finem*, and not *quoad naturam*, that Faith is said to *be dead*; that is, *ut medium, non ut fides* (still remembring that we speak of *Assent:*) And why should it not be so in this point of the *perfecting* of Faith? *viz. Works perfect it*, ut medium, non ut fides (as before.)

3. To whom was *Abraham*'s Faith *manifested* to be perfect? Not to *men*, that saw not his act, or at least, saw not his Faith by it, or would rather *condemn* him: Not to *God*, to whom all things are *manifest*, though by an Anthropopathy he say, *Now I know that thou fearest God*, &c.

4. To your second I say, 1. That Faith hath *more acts* than one: Your self before said, *Three* at least. 2. It's cloudy to say, [*Believing justifieth, but not as our act, but in respect of its Object, Christ*, &c.] For it is *neither*: But *qua conditio præstita.* Why doth not the *Object* justifie without the *Act?* Is it because God *could* not so order it, or because he *would* not? Doubtless the latter: And therefore the *Donor's Will* only createth the formal interest of Faith in justifying: As the Holy Ghost giveth the *matter.* We know Christ is the *meritorious Cause*: But the Question is, What interest or place *Faith* hath? Either it is *causa vel conditio:* For no doubt it is *medium Morale, & non tantum naturale* (as your words would insinuate:) And I know not what *moral Medium* it can be else, but either *causa vel conditio:* I think it is no *proper Cause*, therefore a *Condition.* To say, [*It justifieth in respect to its Object,*] is to speak darkness. Will *any respect* give it that interest? Hath not *Love, Joy*, &c. respect to Christ? Have not all Gospel Ordinances respect

to

to him? *What respect* then is it? Either of a *Cause*, or a *Condition*, or somewhat. 3. I have shewed in how many *respects* Works do perfect Faith, besides *manifesting* it. Is mere *manifesting* a *saving means? James* saith, [*Can Faith save him?*] Yes, without *Manifestation*, if that were all: If the very manifesting be not part of the *Condition* of Salvation. Works perfect Faith *ut medium & ut conditio*, though not *ut fides, vel ut causa operum.* Doth fruit no otherwise perfect the tree, than by *Manifestation?* I am not of your mind in that, I think the tree is perfected, as the *totum integrale* by the accretion of a noble part, and also as a *medium* in attaining a *chief end.*

5. To your third I say, *Procreation* perfecteth Marriage *ut medium perficitur per finem*, though not in the *essence* of Marriage: And so doth *Works perfect Faith*, though *Works* be but the *neareſt end*, and not the *ultimate.* This is the Illustration which you could not see.

6. But my fullest Explication is in the next, where I doubt not is your greatest overslight. Faith is not *God's Covenant*, but the *Condition of it:* But Faith is *our Covenant it self. Faith* and *Covenanting* is the same thing (as Dr. *Preston* oft makes it the Marriage-Covenant:) To *Consent* (after Assent, that is still implied) that Christ as offered in his *Offices*, and to these *uses*, shall be *mine*, and that I will accordingly *be his*, is *justifying Faith*, and is the *Covenant* on our *part* (as to the *heart-Covenant:*) And the profession of this Faith (if fully) is nothing but *open covenanting.* And therefore my similitude doth *quadrare*: And just as the *Marriage-Covenant* is *perfected* by after-*Marriage*, *Faithfulness*,

fulness, *Love*, *Subjection*; so is *Faith perfected* by *Works*; that is, not *in esse conjugii*, *fidei*, *unionis initæ*; but as the *medium*, that is, the *Condition* of *continuing the interest* which Faith alone hath obtained. But then as to the *Title*, to the *great Absolution* at *Judgment*, and to Salvation, *Works* in our case go beyond Marriage-fidelity in the similitude.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *Faith alone is not the entire perfect Condition of the New-Covenant, but Faith with Repentance, and sincere Obedience is.*

Animadvers.

In all points (I grant) Faith alone is not the entire Condition of the New-Covenant; but yet it is for so much as concerns Justification, because Faith alone doth apprehend Christ, by whose Righteousness we are justified. It is true, some Repentance must go before Justification: but no Repentance without Faith, will avail to Justification: And for the Reason pre-alledged, Justification is ascribed, not to Repentance; but to Faith only. As for sincere Obedience, it proceeds from Faith, and so follows Justification, and therefore is not a Condition pre-required for the obtaining of it.

Reply.

1. Your first Assertion and its Reason is already denied; and you attempt not the proof of it.

2. What if Repentance will not avail without Faith? may it not therefore avail with it?

3. Remission of sin is ordinarily ascribed to Repentance as the Condition; and therefore your Reason pre-alledged, is no Scripture-Reason, nor sound.

4. Sincere Obedience goes before that Justification which it is the Condition of, though it follow the beginning of Justification.

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Page 302. *SO I acknowledg, that the very first point of Justification is by Faith alone, without either the Concomitancy, or Co-operation of Works; for they cannot be performed in an instant. But the continuance and accomplishment of Justification, is not without the joynt-procurement of Obedience.*

Animadverf.

1. Here (methinks) you yield the whole Cause. For if we be first justified by Faith alone, then Works do not concur with Faith to procure our Justification, seeing it is procured already by Faith alone without Works.

2. And as our Justification is begun, so it is continued. It is begun by the beginning of Faith, and continued by the continuance of Faith: Though true justifying Faith can neither continue nor begin without a fitness to produce Works, and so an actual production of them in due time.

Reply.

If this Concession will make us one, I think I shall never recall it. But it is a strange yielding of the Cause.

1. Works do not concur to procure that first change, which makes us *justos ex injustis*: Doth it follow that therefore they concur not as Conditions of that *continued Moral* act of God by his *Covenant*, by which he doth truly justifie us every day.

2. If that be a good Reason, then no *act of Faith* through our lives doth justifie us, but the *first act*: for every *after-act* findeth us justified. But that this is false, I prove 1. *Ad hominem*: You confess it in the next lines, that our Justification is continued by the *Continuance* of Faith; and that *Continuance* is as truly *justifying* as the first. Which is fully proved. 2. In that the act of Faith, which the

the Scripture saith was imputed to *Abraham* for Righteousness, was not his first act. Nor that of *Abel*, *Enoch*, *Noah*, *Moses*; &c. mentioned in *Heb.* 11. I take this for plain proof. 3. The sum of all your mistake is your Assertion, that [*As our Justification is begun, so it is continued,*] which meaning of the *Condition* is far from truth. It is *continued* by the same *God*, *Christ*, *Merit*, *Covenant*; But not by the same *condition* only. 1. Your next words contradict this: For the first act of Faith (which you say *begins* it) and the *continuance* (that is, the renewed acts; for the *same act* continueth not) is not all one. But if you mean *specifically*, though not *numerically* the same; that's not so neither. 2. I have proved out of many Scriptures, that [*forgiving others*,] *Repentance* of after-sins, *praying* for Pardon, sincere Obedience, *&c.* are by God made conditions of Continuance. 3. And (that it may not seem strange) it is usually so in almost all conveyance of Right by Contracts. There is more put in the Contract as the *Condition* of *continuing Right*, than of *first possessing* it. Marriage, Consent or Contract on the Womans part, is all the Condition of her first right to her Husband, and his Honours and Estate: But Fidelity, Love, Subjection (specially of the Church to Christ, who is also absolute Lord) is also part of the Condition of Continuance. Your Servant shall have first right to the priviledges of a Servant in your Family upon the bare Contract; but it shall not be *continued* but on his faithful serving you. A Tenant hath *first Right* and *Possession* on his Lease and Fine; but the *Continuance* is on Condition that he also pay his *Rent*. The Subject hath the priviledges of a Subject,

ject on his *engaging* to the Sovereign Power; but the *Continuance* is on his *fidelity* and actua obedience to the Laws. And the Reason is, because in all these Covenants, there is besides the present *Covenanting* (which is all that's first required) somewhat promised and covenanted to be done for the future, that the benefits may be enjoyed. We covenant to do something which must be done. In what sense soever *James* saith, Abraham *was justified by Works* (supposing it *coram Deo*), I think his Justification was *begun* without them. This therefore I conceive to be the root of most of your mistakes in this point.

Aphorism.

Page 303. *First, say they*, Abraham's *Faith was perfected long before.* Answ. *Not as it is a fulfilling of that Condition which also requireth its acting by obedience.*

Animadvers.

But *Abraham*'s Faith was perfect long before, as it is the fulfilling of that Condition which is required unto Justification: For by it long before he was justified, *Gen.*15. 6.

Reply.

Just as a woman hath fulfilled the *Marriage-Conditions* by her actual *Marriage* (which is fulfilling enough to *give* her an *Interest*, but not to *continue* it:) And as you fulfil the Sovereigns Conditions of enjoying the priviledges of a Subject, by engaging to him as Sovereign: Which is enough for first Possession, but not for Continuance.

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *Abraham* (say they) *was justified long before* Isaac *was offered, therefore that could be but a manifesting of it.* Answ. *Justification is a continued act: God is still justifying, and the Gospel still justifying.* Abraham's *Justification was not ended before.*

Animadvers.

Though Justification be a *continued act*, yet nevertheless *Abraham* was justified long before he offered *Isaac*, as the series of the History doth clearly shew. *Abraham*'s Justification (I grant) was not ended before, nor yet after: it shall never end. For Christ's Righteousness whereby we are justified, is an everlasting Righteousness. *Dan.* 9.24. and therefore our Justification is an everlasting Justification. But if you mean, that *Abraham*'s Justification was not perfect before he was but half justified, or but in part: If this be your meaning, it agrees neither with Scripture nor Reason that I can see. The Scripture saith, that he was justified, his Faith was imputed unto him for Righteousness: It no where intimateth that his Justification was incomplete, and part of it then, and another part a long time after. He was so justified, that Righteousness was imputed unto him; he was reputed of God just and righteous: And what is more required? Indeed if he had not shewed his Faith by his Works, he had shewed that his Faith was not such whereby he could be justified; and so the Scripture had not been fulfulled, which saith, *Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for Righteousness.* Therefore all that St. *James* requires is, that we shew our Faith by our Works.

Reply.

1. I have fully told you what was wanting. His Justification in Application to *Abraham* as the subject *in præsenti statu* was perfect: But that Justification would not have been perfect to him a year after, when he was to be justified from the guilt of many more sins.

2. And

2. And his Justification was to be *continued*, which could not be done by the *same means* alone that begun it. The relation will cease *cessante fundamento*: And if *Works* had not been added to Faith, the *Fundamentum*, (the *Gospel-Grant* and *Virtual-Sentence*) would have ceased for want of that performance of the Condition.

3. Sentential Justification (which is the most proper, full, noble Justification) is either not at all till Judgment, or certainly not perfect till then. You are not yet freed from all Satan's Accusations till at that Bar and Day.

4. You argue not soundly, [*Christ's Righteousness is everlasting, therefore our Justification is so*:] I believe the truth of the Conclusion, but not that it follows your premises, except you add much more to it.

Aphorism.

Page 308. IN Rom. 3.28. & 4.2,3,14,15,16. Gal. 2.16. & 3.21, 22. Ephes. 2. 8, 9. Phil. 3.8, 9. *the Apostle's dispute is upon this Question, What is the Righteousness which we must plead against the Accusation of the Law, or by which we are justified as the proper Righteousness of that Law? And this he well concludeth is neither Works nor Faith, but the Righteousness which is by Faith, that is, Christ's Righteousness.*

Animadvers.

1. If we be fully freed from the accusation of the Law, we are fully justified: For what can accuse or condemn us, if not the Law? therefore if the Righteousness of Christ be that which we must plead against the Accusation of the Law, then the Righteousness of Christ is that whereby we are fully justified. What need then of a twofold Righteousness, as that by which we must

must be justified, as you have said before? Faith indeed is required, that the Righteousness of Christ may be apprehended by us, and imputed to us, that we may be justified by it: But here Faith is no distinct Righteousness by which we are justified, but only the Condition required of us, that the Righteousness of Christ may be ours to Justification. And in this respect only are we said to be justified by Faith, because it apprehendeth Christ's Righteousness whereby we are justified.

Reply.

1. That you may be fully freed from the Condemnation of the Law, and so be fully justified, you must first perform the Condition of the New-Testament, or New-Law, and so be just *quoad præstationem conditionis.*

If any had rather say, that the general Obligation to Obedience is more properly said to be our very *subjection*, and a result of God's Relation to us, than the effect of any Law, and so that it is neither the Old-Covenant nor the New that causeth this general Obligation, and so that Faith in Christ is a duty of the New-Covenant only, because it is there only commanded *in specie*, I think he will speak more properly than either Mr. *C.* or I have here done.

2. This Condition being imposed by a New-Law, backed with its Sanction, is therefore it self a Righteousness in the sense of that Law: For the fulfilling of the Conditions of a Law, is a real Righteousness in the sense of that Law, when the Question is, *de Titulo ad præmium, vel de reatu pœnæ.*

3. As *Bradshaw* well saith, Christ satisfied not for all that we should perform to the Law, but all that we should perform, and did not; (that is, for our sins) except this Condition of the New-Covenant. This Condition therefore (as before is shewed) is part of the Duty of the Old-Law (in the sense before opened) taken out and made a New-Law by conjunction

junction with a New-Sanction (as *Adam*'s Body from the Earth) and so imposed as of indispensible necessity, and the final neglect of it excepted from pardon. And so when-ever you call it [the Condition,] and deny the performance to be a Righteousness in sense of that Law, you contradict your self. Yet as the New-Law is but *Lex Remedians*, and so a *Subordinate Law*; so is *this Righteousness* but a *subordinate Righteousness*, having the nature of a *medium* to the Righteousness of the *Old Law*: Neither of them alone, but both together, are *Justitia universalis*: But the Righteousness of the Old-Law, had it been performed by our selves, would have been *Justitia universalis*: And *Christ's Righteousness* imputed is nearest to it; for there is excepted out of it, only our own performance of the Condition of the New-Testament. As therefore the *medium* goes before the *end*, so we must have this *personal Righteousness præstitæ conditionis Novi-Testamenti*, before we can have that which freeth us from the Law.

4. To your Question, I say, The Accuser of the Brethren can accuse you besides the Law: And the New-Law will accuse Unbelievers and Rebels against Christ, besides the *Old Law*: (*The Words that I speak shall judg you*, &c.) And you must have a Righteousness *Evangelical* of your *own performance* to plead against Satan's Accusation, that you are an Unbeliever, Hypocrite, Rebel; or else never be sententially justified.

S Aphor.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *But now St.* James's *question is, What is the Condition of our Justification by this Righteousness of Christ, Whether Faith only, or Works also?*

Animadverf.

St. *James* (that I see) doth not propound either expresly or implicitely any such Question, but only doth confute those that rely on such a Faith as is without Works. See *James* 2. 14,15,16,17,18. The different state of the Question, as handled by St. *Paul* in his Epistles to the *Romans* and *Galatians*, and as handled by St. *James* in *Chap.* 2. is well expressed by *Beza* in *Jac.* 2. 14. *Illic de causâ quæstio est: hic vero de effectis: Illic à causa ad effecta descenditur, hic ab effectis ascenditur ad causam. Illic quæritur quomodo Justificemur? hic quomodo justificati fuisse intelligamur: Illic excluduntur opera tanquam Justificationis causæ: hic stabiliuntur tanquam Justificationis causæ: hic stabiliuntur tanquam Justificationis effecta. Illic negantur opera præcedere Justificandos: hic dicuntur Justificatos consequi.*

Reply.

His whole Dispute is against those that rely on Faith alone without Works. But *how* did they rely on *Faith?* As their *Legal Righteousness*, instead of *Christ's Satisfaction?* I trow not, nor will you say so. It was therefore as the *Condition* of the *New Covenant* that they relied on it; or else I pray tell me how, and under what notion? And therefore *James*'s scope must needs be, to prove that Faith alone is not the *Condition:* [*Can Faith save him? A man is justified by Works, and not by Faith only*, &c.] I am loth to stand to open the mistakes in *Beza*'s words. To his first difference. 1. *Paulus non loquitur de fide ut de causâ Justificationis (non enim est causa) nec ut de causâ operum: (hoc enim nihil*

nihil esset ad rem suam) Jacobus *quærit de fidei effectis, sed non quâ effecta. Ad differentiam secundam idem dicendum est. Ad tertiam,* Jacobus *non quærit tantum quomodo Justificati fuisse intelligamur: Sed quomodo, vel quibus mediis Justificamur quoad confirmationem, continuationem & quoad sententiam, nec non quomodo salvemur. Ad quartam, Ut* Paulus *excludit opera ut Justificationis causa, ita & ego: Stabiliuntur autem à* Jacobo *non tantum ut Justificationis effecta, sed etiam ut conditiones & media: Effecti (enim) ut effecti nulla est necessitas moralis ad finem: Sed opera hic stabiliuntur ut necessaria ad Justificationem,* Vers. 22, 23, 24, 26. *& salutem,* Vers. 14. *Ad quintam, Et ego opera Justificationis initium præcedere pernego: Sed* Jacobus *non tantum dicit opera Justificationem consequi, sed ad Justificationem ulteriorem, & salutem esse necessaria.*

Aphorism.

Page 309. PAul *doth either in expreß words, or in the sence and scope of his speech, only exclude the Works of the Law, that is, the fulfilling the Conditions of the Law our selves: But never the fulfilling of the Gospel-Conditions, that we may have part in Christ.*

Animadvers.

Paul doth absolutely exclude *Works* from Justification, as I proved before. Though sometimes he mentions the Works of the Law, yet not so as if by some *other Works* we might and should be justified. For indeed, *all Works*, if *good*, are Works of the Law, *i. e.* Works which the Law doth require: And to be justified by Works (of what sort soever) as *Works*, is to be justified by the *Law*. And therefore to the Righteousness which is of the Law, *Paul* opposeth the Righteousness which is of faith, *Rom.* 10. 5, 6. even as he opposeth Working to Beleeving, *Rom.* 4. 5. So that to be justified by the Law, and to be justified by Works (any Works, whatsoever they be) is

one and the same thing, and contradistinct to being justified by Faith or Believing. Though therefore believing be working, yet we are not justified by believing, as it is working so as to rest in that Work, as a Work for Justification: But we are justified by believing, in that thereby we are made partakers of the Righteousness of Christ, which is the only Righteousness whereby we are justified.

2. It is most sure, *Paul* doth not exclude that fulfilling of the Gospel-Conditions, that we may have part in Christ; *viz.* that so in Christ we may have Righteousness; and by that Righteousness may be justified; which by any Righteousness of our own, out of Christ, we cannot be. *Paul* so excludes Works, that he *sets* up Faith: and he so sets up Faith, that he sets up Christ, as him by whose Righteousness, through Faith imputed to us, we are justified. By him all that believe are justified, *Acts* 13. 39. And so much you acknowledg presently after, saying, [Paul *doth by the word* Faith] *especially direct your thoughts to Christ believed in. For to be justified by Christ, and to be justified by receiving Christ, is with him all one.*

Reply.

1. All Works are not the fulfilling the *Old-Laws Condition*, nor performed with such a conceit.

2. To be justified by the *New Law*, against the Accusation of *Unbelief* or *Rebellion* against Christ that bought us, by our Faith and Obedience, is not to be justified by the Law of Works against the Accusation of being Sinners.

3. You are fain your self to distinguish between *quod opus*, and *quâ opus*, lest Faith be shut out: and I need no more to keep in *obedience* to Christ. For when you should have told us what the [*qua*] is in which Faith is included, you say, [*In that thereby we are made partakers of Christ's*, &c.] But either you mean (by this dark equivocal) *quâ apprehensio*, that is, *qua fides*, *vel qua conditio naturalis* (which I have at large confuted in another Brother's Notes;) or you mean *quâ conditio* as you must, or none:)

And

And so say I of Obedience: It doth continue our title to Christ as a Condition which Faith begun. 2. The rest I assent to.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *And when he doth mention Faith as the Condition, he alway implieth Obedience to Christ; therefore* [*Believing*] *and* [*obeying the Gospel*] *are put for the two Summaries of the whole Condition.*

Animadverf.

When he mentioneth Faith as the Condition of our Justification, he doth not imply *Obedience* as that which must concur with Faith to Justification, though he imply it as a fruit of that Faith whereby we are justified. They that have believed, must be careful to maintain good Works, *Tit.* 3. 8.

Reply.

He implieth Obedience, not as concurrent with Faith in our first Justification, but in the Continuance and Consummation. He implieth Obedience in requiring Faith as truly, as he that subjecteth himself to a Prince, doth imply future Obedience in his engagement to obey.

Aphorism.

Page 310. *That we are justified by sincere Obedience to Christ, as the secondary part of the Condition of our Justification, is evident also from these following Scriptures*, Matth. 12. 37. & 11. 25, 26. Luke 6. 37. Matth. 6. 12, 14, 15. 1 Joh. 1. 9. Acts 8. 22. & 3. 19. & 22. 16. 1 Pet. 4. 18. Rom. 6. 16. 1 Pet. 12. 22.

Animadvers.

Some of these places prove, that justifying Faith must shew it self by the fruit of sincere Obedience, as *Mat.* 12. 37. *Mar.* 11. 25,26. *Luke* 6. 37. *Mat.* 6. 12,14,15. *Rom.* 6.16. Some of them shew, that Repentance and turning to God is required as Antecedent to Justification, as 1 *John* 1. 19. *Acts* 3. 19. But this turning to God is by Faith; and without Faith all Repentance is vain and unprofitable, as that of *Judas* was. To the same purpose is that, *Acts* 8. 22. where together with Repentance, is joyned Prayer; but it must be the prayer of Faith, *James* 5.15. So that still it is Faith that doth all in point of Justification. That *Acts* 22. 16. *Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord*, imports only (I think) thus much, that by being baptized, *Paul* was to have the washing away of his sins confirmed to him; for he was already a Believer, and so his sins through faith in Christ's blood were washed away: His Baptism therefore was only to confirm this to him, and to assure him more fully of it. What 1 *Pet.* 1. 2,22. & 4.18. are to the matter in hand, I cannot see: Perhaps these places are misprinted.

Reply.

1. Your word, [*must shew it self*, &c.] expresseth a necessity: What is the necessity of the addition of Obedience? Is it only *ex necessitate Præcepti*, that is, Obedience is a *Duty?* Then a man may be saved without it; which is not true. Is it *necessitas medii?* What *kind* of *medium* then is it? It is too much to say, *a Cause:* I know no other than to say *a Condition: Antecedens qua tale non est medium.*

2. Let's peruse some of the Texts, *Matth.* 12.37. *By thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned.* What expressions would you expect to satisfie you, if these be not plain enough? Is not this as plain as, [*We are justified by Faith?*] Mark 11. 25,26. Mat. 6.12, 14,15, Luke 6. 37, &c. Are you able to invent words, wherein the nature of a *Condition* is expressed more plainly than

than in these, [*For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you : But if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your heavenly Father forgive your trespasses.*] Prove if you can, that *Faith* is a *Condition*, by plainer words than these! So 1 *John* 1.9. *If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness?* Acts 3. 19. *Repent ye therefore and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the time of refreshing shall come*, &c.] Is here nothing but *Antecedency?* Can you plainlier express *necessitatem medii?* So *Acts* 8.22. [*Repent and pray*, &c.] I never believed that Repentance and Prayer are but *Antecedents* of Forgiveness, and *no means?* nor ever mean to believe it. We have got an honest custom of calling *Prayer* a *means*, which will disadvantage you herein. Hath *Prayer* and *Repentance* no *Conducement* to the obtaining of the end? This would much cool Prayer, if throughly received. And what *means* below a *Condition*, can you imagine these to be, for Remission of sins? yet I call them but the *secondary part* of the *Condition*. And if I had but said, they are *Conditiones conditionis ut à Deo acceptandæ*, I had said as much as this: For as *Causa causæ est causa causati*; so *Conditio acceptandæ conditionis est conditio conditionati*. To that *Acts* 22. 16. I shall say little, having said so much in my Book of Baptism. As the solemnizing of a King's Coronation, or a Mayors or Bailiffs Instalment in his Office, by taking his Oath, is not the Confirmation of that which before was compleated, but the compleating of that which before was incompleat; so is Faith of the *heart* without *solemn Baptismal Covenanting*

(where it may be done) but a *means* of *Justification*, not yet *compleated*. In 1 *Pet.* 1. 22. there is this to the matter in hand, that *Sanctification* of the Spirit is a *means* or *cause* of *Obedience*, and *Obedience* a *means* to the *sprinkling of Christ's blood*, and the Soul is *purified* by *obeying the Truth*; which may include Purification from the *guilt* of sin, as well as the *power*. And 1 *Pet.* 4. 18. the Righteousness and diligence of the Righteous, is a *means* to their *Salvation*, as it is opposed to the ungodlie's *not standing in Judgment*. Many more Texts might be brought to this end, besides those in the *Aphoris.* Perhaps I shall add some when we come to speak of the Conditions of Salvation.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *OUr full Justification, and our everlasting Salvation, have the same Conditions on our part: But sincere Obedience is without all doubt the Condition of our Salvation; therefore also of our Justification.*

Animadvers.

Our Justification here is full, though the fulness of it doth not so fully appear as it shall hereafter. For Christ being received into our hearts by Faith, we are fully justified, even acquitted from all sin, and freed from all Condemnation, *Acts* 13. 39. *Rom.* 8. 1. 33.

Reply.

This is a mistake that, methinks, it should not be hard to convince you of. You are at first believing acquitted from all sin that you are then *guilty of*, and all *Condemnation* which the *Law virtually* hath at *that time* against you (*Actualiter enim condemnare judicis est, non Legis:*) But you are not acquit of all or any of the sins of your *whole life afterward.*

2. And

2. And you *hold* that same Justification, but on the performance of a *further Condition* than the first which begun it.

3. And *sentential Justification* is the most proper Justification and full; and that is not full (if at all) till Judgment. I laid great weight on this Thesis (seeing Scripture is so plain, that *Obedience* is a Condition of *Salvation*, that our Divines ordinarily acknowledge it) (as our Assembly fully in the *Catech.*) I expected therefore that you should either deny the *major* or *minor*, but you deny neither, if I understand you, but only take hold of the word [*Full.*] But I will not so leave you, but desire you to tell me: 1. *Whether sentential Justification at Judgment, be properly Justification or not?* 2. If it *be*, (as doubtless it is) then, *Whether that Justification and our Salvation have not the same Conditions?* If you say, No: I expect some Reason of your Negation: And I undertake to prove the contrary from Scripture. 3. Whether *Obedience* joyned to *Faith* and *Perseverance in both*, be not the *proper Condition* of our *Salvation?* It is beyond doubt as much as the truth of Scripture I think.

Aphorism.

Page 311. *IT would be as derogatory to Christ's Righteousness, if we be* saved *by Works, as if we be justified by them.*

Animadvers.

True, if we be saved by the *merit* of Good-works: Yet they are *via Regni*, though not *causa Regnandi*: therefore they must go before Salvation, I mean the full accomplishment of it: But not so *before Justification.* First, we must be justified, and then do good Works, *Tit.* 3. 8. But we must first do good Works, and then be saved, *Rom.* 2. 6, 7.

Reply.

Reply.

Your Answer would much confirm me in my judgment, if I doubted: 1. I reasoned from the common Argument that is brought against me, as being invalid (which is, That it is an encroaching on the honour of Christ and his Righteousness, and free Grace, for a man to be justified by sincere Obedience to Christ, as the secondary part of the Condition of continued and sentential Justification) thus: If it be not derogatory to Christ's Righteousness that we be *saved* by such Works, then it is not derogatory to it that we be *justified* by them: But, *&c.* therefore, *&c.* To the *minor* only you answer, [*True if we be saved by the merit of them.*] A true and sound Answer! But why say you not so of *Justification* also, nor yet give a Reason of the difference? If we were *justified* by the *merit* of *Obedience*, then it would be derogatory to Christ's Righteousness: But we are not justified by the merit of it; therefore, *&c.* 2. I would I knew what you mean by *via Regni*. Sure *via* is more than an Antecedent. And if a *means*, you should tell us, what it is less than a *Condition*. 3. Must not Obedience go as much before Justification at Judgment, as before Salvation? Or must you indeed be first justified at Judgment before you obey? If you should insist on it, that Justification at Judgment *per sententiam judicis* is no proper *Justification*, but a *Declaration* of it, you will have all the World of Lawyers and Divines against you, and I need not say more. Indeed it is not such a *constitutive Justification* as that *per Legem*, but it is *more*, a proper and full Justification of another kind, to which this is but a means.

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Ibid. THat which a man is justified by, he is saved by.

Animadvers.

He is thereby put into a state of Salvation. *For whom he justified, them he also glorified,* Rom.8.30. Yet are we not fully possessed of Salvation, not glorified without good Works, as we are fully justified without them. They follow Justification as fruits of that Faith whereby we are justified: But they go before Glorification, as making way for the enjoyment of it.

Reply.

1. They go as much before Justification by *Sentence*, and as *continued*, as before *Glorification*.

2. Our debate is about *conveyance of Right*. In justifying, it is the same thing to *give Right* to it, and to give the *thing it self*. In *Glorification*, and all *real Mutations* it is not so. You yield the thing that I assert.

Aphorism.

Ibid. YEt here I say still, [our full Justification,] *because as I have shewed, our first possession of it is upon our mere Faith and Contract with Christ.*

Animadvers.

Our first possession of Justification is so full, as that there is no Condemnation belonging to us: And what can be more full, but only a more full manifestation of it.

Reply.

I have troubled you too oft already with repeating the same things. Though there be now no Condemnation to you, yet to morrow there will be, if you should not sincerely obey: For you would cease to be in Christ.

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Ibid. & 312. *I Think our Glorification will be acknowledged to have the same Conditions with our first Justification at the Bar of Christ, and why not to our continued Justification on earth?*

Animadvers.

Our Justification in the last Judgment is not properly a *compleating* of our Justification, as if it were only *begun* here, and left imperfect till hereafter: But it is only a publick manifestation of it. Thus your self expresses it, *Append.* p. 158. [*Indeed there is a Justification by publick Declaration at the great Judgment*, &c.] But Glorification being the compleatment of Salvation, whatever is requisite as Antecedaneous to compleat Salvation, is required as a Condition of our Glorification.

Reply.

Ad eadem sunt eadem dicenda. Justification at Judgment is not a mere *constituting* us *Righteous*, but a *declaring* us *Righteous*. But it is a *declaring* of a *Righteousness* in *Question*, and that by a *Supreme Judg* against a *publick Accuser*, which is requisite *ad plenam possessionem Præmii per Legem justis debiti:* And so it is not *only Declarare, sed statuere & jus Vindicare:* And is more properly called justifying, than [*making just*] is: (You here confess a Condition of Glorification.)

Aphorism.

Page 312. *And hath no hand in their Justification that giveth them* right *to the tree of Life*, &c.

Animadvers.

They that keep God's Commandments, are said [*to have right to the Tree of Life,*] Rev. 22. 14. because such have true Faith in Christ: And that it is indeed that giveth them that right. *You are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus*

sus, Gal. 3. 26. *And if Children, then heirs, heirs of God, joynt-heirs with Christ*, Rom. 8. 17. We may also distinguish between *jus ad rem*, and *Jus in re*. Faith in Christ alone gives the former right to the Tree of Life: But Works help to the attainment of the latter.

Reply.

1. The Text saith, [*That they may have right, and may enter in*, &c.] Doth Obedience *get Faith?* (surely no: not as it is here meant.) Doth it *only manifest it?* How then doth Obedience *procure right?* Will you again say here, that by [*keeping the Commandments*,] is not meant [*keeping the Commandments*,] but [*a working Faith.*] It is not only *James*, but multitudes of other plain Texts that must be forced, if your Opinion must stand. If this Text do not plainly make Obedience to be a *means* of our *right* to the Tree of Life, I know not how to understand sense by words.

2. *Faith* may give them *right*, and so may *Obedience* too. You argued thus even now [*Repentance will not serve without Faith; therefore Faith doth all:*] nego sequelam.

3. If you mean properly by [*Jus in re*] *right* to *mediate Possession*, and not the *Possession it self* (which is no *right*) you grant as much as I need.

4. But the Text doth most plainly ascribe both sorts of *right* to Obedience. Ad rem [*right to the Tree of Life:*] Jure, [*may enter in by the gate.*]

5. Do you indeed believe, that a man can have *jus ad gloriam* by *Faith*, without Obedience, if he live to age.

6. Or will you debase Faith so much as to say, that it is sufficient to give only *jus ad rem*, and not *jus in re:* Indeed it is the same right that comes by both: Even *jus ad rem & in re.*

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Page 313. *BEsides all those Texts under* Thes. 22. *which prove a personal Righteousness, so called from the Conformity to the Gospel.*

Animadvers.

A personal Gospel-Righteousness is acknowledged to be requisite, but not as that whereby we are justified.

Reply.

Enough of this already.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *SEE* Rom. 8. 4, 13.

Animadvers.

In *Rom.* 8. 4. the Righteousness of the Law is said to be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. But I see not what this makes for you, who speak of an Evangelical Righteousness, which is contradistinct to Legal Righteousness. And for the words themselves, if they speak of a perfect and exact fulfilling of the Righteousness of the Law, then it is by *Imputation.* And so *Calvin* expounds it, *Hoc ad veniam referre necesse est*, &c. And so one more ancient than *Calvin* or *Luther* expounds that in the *Canticles*; *Thou art all fair my Love, and there is no spot in thee:* Sine maculâ deputatur, quia culpa non imputatur. Otherwise it must be understood of an *inchoate* and imperfect fulfilling, which is not sufficient unto Justification. See *Psal.* 18. 21, 22, 23. & 119. 6. B. *Davenant* in answer to *Bellarmine* objecting this place, makes use of both Expositions. *De Just. act. c.* 52. *p.* 562. That in *Rom.* 8. 13. *For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall dye: But if ye through the Spirit, mortifie the deeds of the flesh, ye shall live:* That, I say proves, that a continued course in sin is damnable; and that Holiness and Obedience is necessary unto Salvation: Which by the beginning of the Paragraph may seem to be all that you aimed at, and it were pity any should deny you this: But it proves not (as ye in words immediately foregoing, and so also those before-cited, you seem to intend) that a personal Righteousness is necessary unto Salvation.

Reply.

Reply.

1. An *inchoate and imperfect* Righteousness (as you call it; and truly *quoad materiam remotam*) is sufficient to justifie us against the Accusation of *Not fulfilling* of the *Gospel-Conditions*.

2. Instead of discussing the sense of this Text, I will refer you to *Ludov. de Dieu in loc.* where also you shall find the same Doctrine that I deliver. *Rom.* 8. 13. proves fully, not only that Obedience is necessary to Salvation, *necessitate præcepti*, but that it is a proper *Condition* of it, and necessary *necessitate medii*. I would you would have told me how it is necessary?

And here by the way, let me mind you of one thing, which I have not fully done yet: You make a great difference between the Condition of *Justification*, and the Condition of *Salvation*. Indeed both have the *same Condition*, if you speak of *right to Salvation*, and of *justifying* that *Right* against all Accusers. (And as *Reatus pœnæ* is the most full proper *Guilt*, so this contrary Justification is the most full proper Justification.) When a man is *accused* to be *Reus mortis*, the Child of Death; he that proves him to be *non-reum*, doth thereby justifie him against that Accusation. Now that is proved, by proving him to have performed the *Condition* of Life, or not done that which *Death* is denounced against. This Text in hand saith, [*If ye live after the flesh ye shall die: But if ye by the Spirit do mortifie the deeds of the body, ye shall live.*] Here is a great part of the New-Law. Now if a man be accused as guilty of this *Death*, he that proveth that he lived not after the flesh, but mortified it, doth most properly *justifie* him. And yet here is

no

no talk of Justification or pardon of sin in the Text: What of that? The same Covenant promiseth or giveth *Justification* and *right* to Salvation on the *same Conditions*; but more frequently mentioneth *Salvation*, as containing all other benefits: But certainly he that against an Accuser proves a man's interest in a *promise of Salvation*, doth *eo nomine* justifie that man, though that Promise mention not *Justification*. Our first *accepting Christ* for Lord and Saviour (supposing *our taking God* for our *only God*, and *chief Good*) doth give us an *immediate right* to *Justification* and *Salvation*; and if then we died, we should be saved. But our obeying Christ, and confiding in him as a Lord and Saviour (according to our Covenant) doth *continue* (as a Condition) our right to *both* Justification and Salvation. It seems to me an ungrounded fancy (such as Divines have spun many of, to perplex poor Souls and themselves, going the Schoolmens way of adding their devised conceits, even while they blame them) to make *one thing* (the single act of *Faith only*) to be the *Condition* of *Justification*, and *Obedience* to be the *Condition* of *Glorification*. And yet (to deal freely with you) I meet with none more guilty of this than you. For you discern, that the ordinary Doctrine of Faith's justifying as an *Instrument*, is not exact or proper, and therefore you affirm it to be the *sole Condition* of *Justification*. Whereas other Divines tell me, that *Faith* and *Obedience* are both *Conditions* of *Justification* (and in that are like) but *Faith* only is the *Instrument* of *Justification*: (And in that they differ.)

Aphoriſm.

Ibid. *HE that maketh Faith and Obedience to Chriſt to be only the fulfilling of the Condition of the New-Covenant, and ſo to be only Conditions of Juſtification, doth give them no part of the work of his Righteouſneſs, ſeeing he came not to fulfil the Goſpel, but the Law.*

Animadverſ.

1. The fulfilling of the Law is that whereby we are juſtified, as by the tranſgreſſion of the Law we are condemned. Now Chriſt hath fulfilled the Law for us, having made ſatisfaction for our breach of it, *Gal.* 3. 10,13. therefore by Chriſt's Satisfaction we are juſtified. This the Goſpel doth hold unto us, requiring of us Faith to receive Chriſt, and to apply his Satisfaction, that we may take the benefit of it, and be juſtified by it, *Acts* 13. 38,39.

But, 2. The Goſpel doth not joyn Obedience with Faith, as the Condition of our Juſtification, though it require Obedience as that which doth follow upon juſtifying Faith, and flow from it. *Tit.* 3. 8.

Reply.

1. The fulfilling of the Conditions of the New-Law, is that whereby we are juſtified againſt the Accuſation, 1. Of *non*-fulfilling it: 2. And ſo of having no part in Chriſt, nor pardon by him; 3. But being guilty of the far ſorer puniſhment: Even as for the *non*-fulfilling of this Condition, all the World (that hear the Goſpel) are condemned. Now Chriſt hath not fulfilled *this Condition* for us; and therefore we are not in this juſtified by his Satisfaction.

2. The Goſpel doth joyn Obedience with Faith as the Condition of Salvation; therefore alſo of juſtifying our *right* to that Salvation, which is the juſtifying of *us*.

T 3. You

3. You seem to yield the *Thesis* it self, that it is not any incroaching upon the honour of Christ, to make Faith in him, and Obedience to him, to be only the fulfilling of the Conditions of the New-Covenant. And I know no other fault that can be charged on this Doctrine.

Aphorism.

Pag. 315. BUt *clearly* Luke, *who speaketh of two Cups (which the other do not) doth apply and subjoyn these words,* [I will drink no more of the fruit of, &c.] *to the Cup which was before the sacramental.*

Animadvers.

By this Reason *Bellarmine* would prove that we have no more certainty from the Scripture, that Wine was in the sacramental Cup, than that Water was in it. But *Jansenius* doth well refute those that apply those words, *Matth.* 26. 29. & *Mark* 14. 25. to the first Cup which *Luke* mentioneth: *At istud non patitur ordo horum Evangelistarum* (saith he) *cum enim nullius alterius Calicis fecerit mentionem praterquam sacri, quando dicitur, ex hoc gemmine, nullus alius calix intelligi potest ab iis demonstratus, quando hujus meminerunt. Jansen. Conc. cap.* 131. *sub finem.* And therefore whereas *Luke* brings in those words, before he speaks of the Institution of the Sacrament, *Austin* (and after him *Jansenius*) doth well expound it by an Anticipation; the words being brought in not in their due order, which *Matthew* and *Mark* observed. Suppose *Luke* had never written his Gospel; How could any have once imagined that the words, [*I will drink no more*, &c.] as related by *Matthew* and *Mark*, could be referred to any other Cup than that of the Sacrament, no other Cup besides being mentioned by them. But though *Matthew* and *Mark* had not written the words as they are in *Luke*, might be taken as related by Anticipation; it being no unusual thing in Scripture, to relate things or words out of that order in which they were done or spoken.

Reply.

Reply.

1. As to my purpose, it is of no great moment in which sense we take: For if Christ did receive the Sacrament of his Supper, it is certain it was but that his example, joyned to his words, might be the *Institution*, and not to *the ends* that we take it; no more than he was *baptized* for *incorporation into himself, burying with himself, remission of sins*, &c. which are our ends.

2. I say, as *Calvin*, *Facile solvitur hic nodus, quia ad rem parum interest quo temporis momento hoc Christus dixerit. Nam huc tantum spectant Evangelistæ, admonitos fuisse discipulos tam de propinqua Magistri sui morte, quam de nova & cœlesti vitâ*, &c. Yea, why not as *Paræus*, *Nihil vero impedit, quin bis idem repetiverit de utroq; poculo: quia neutrum cum illis amplius erat bibiturus.* Or, as *Piscator: Sed nihil est absurdi, si statuamus eadem verba bis dicta esse, semel quidem de poculo paschali, deinde iterum de poculo cœnæ novæ: vel certè verba illa alieno loco vel à* Luca *vel à* Matthæo *esse narrata.* Indeed I wholly comply with *Piscator*'s modesty, in judging it *uncertain*, though men may cast in this or that conjecture. But yet I take it to be *most probable*, that the words belong only to the *Pascal Cup*, as *Grotius* and many more think: And that there is no Anticipation in *Luke*, because *Luke* reporting the whole more fully than the rest, and adding that of the Paschal-Cup, which the other omitted, it is more likely he should be most exact in this: (Though I know not only *Austin* but more of the Ancients, thought Christ received the Sacrament, as *Pelargus in loc.* shews of some.)

3. Your Supposition, (if *Luke* had never written)

ten) might alter the matter were it true: And if *Matthew* and *Mark* had never written, if you would have taken the liberty to dislocate that of *Luke* under the pretence of a never-proved Anticipation, you would have been bolder than I durst be.

Aphorism.

Pag. 317. *TO conclude, it is most clear in Scripture, and beyond all dispute, that our actual, most proper compleat Justification at the great Judgment, will be according to our Works*, &c.

Animadvers.

1. This you oft repeat, and so must I this: That our Justification at the great Judgment, is but the full manifestation of that Justification which we have now through Faith.

2. Works shall then be enquired of but as fruits of Faith, by which Faith, and not by Works, we are now justified, and shall then fully appear to be justified.

Reply.

1. It is *such a Manifestation* of our *Righteousness* by the *Judg*, as is the *propereſt Justification*; *Apello totum mundum juriſconſultorum & Theologorum Reformatorum.* We maintain that the word is to be taken *in ſenſu forenſi* againſt the Papists.

2. To be [*a fruit of Faith*] so considered, is not to be *medium ad ullum finem.* But sure Obedience is *medium ad finem*, and so *enquired* after. Either there is some *end* and *reason* why the *fruits* of *Faith* are enquired after, or else it is an unreasonable action (which who dare imagine?) Will you say with the Antinomians, that the *end* is only to *manifest Faith ut ſigna?* 1. You granted more before, that they are *via ad regnum*: And what Divine doth not grant, that *Obedience* is the *Condition* of *Salvation?* Why then should you not yield, that as *Conditions*, they are enquired after? 2. *Luke*'s phrase. [*Because*

cause thou hast been faithful in a very little, &c.] must signifie at least a *Conditionality*, which is *causa sine qua non*; and not a mere *sign*. 3. The whole Context shews, that *Obedience* is enquired after, as the *Ratio Sententiæ*, and not only as *signs* of something else, which is the *sole Reason*. 4. The uses pretended for this enquiring after mere *signs*, are frivolous. The business of Judgment is to enquire of the *cause*, and to *sentence* the *person* accordingly; and the connexion of the Sentence to this Obedience, by the terms [*Therefore*] and [*Because*,] shews unquestionably, that it is *ipsa causa* that is here spoken of, and not *signa de Causa*. I take [*Cause*] in Law-sense now, and speak not *de Causa Logica*.

Aphorism.

Page 319. SEE Matth. 25. 21, 23, *&c. And most plain is that from the mouth of the Judg himself*, &c. *Matth.* 25. 34, 35.

Animadverf.

What was said immediately before, doth answer what is here objected.

Reply.

And the former Reply satisfies me to that Answer. I only add my desire, that besides all the other Texts you would try, whether these following speak only of *Signs*, and not *Conditions*, Rom. 2. 5,6,7,10. Acts 10. 35. 1 Tim. 4. 16. Rev. 14. 13. 1 John 3. 7. Matth. 7. 24. & 21. 22,23. John 16. 27. [*The Father hath loved you, because ye have loved me*, &c.] 2 Cor. 5. 10. [*according to that he hath done*,] plainly signifieth *causam & non evidentiam*, Phil. 4. 17. Luke 11. 28. 1 Tim. 6. 18,19. 1 Cor.

5. You know the Question that now directly I was on, was only about *Works procurement* of Salvation, and Justification at Judgment thereupon.

6. Do they indeed only shew, [*How they must be qualified,*] and not [*why,*] or the tendency of those Qualifications to the *end*? Review those cited.

7. A man would think that you would be satisfied, if the Scripture did but say, [*By this thou art justified*:] And yet *James* doth say, [*We are justified by Works, and not by Faith only*;] and yet you are never the more satisfied. *In sensu forensi*, [*according to Works*] is equivalent to [*by Works.*]

8. If *Amef.* by [*causalem consequentis,*] mean a proper *cause*, I say so too: But to interpret it of a mere *Consequentia* * *Logica*, makes it next *non*-sense. For Christ doth not speak this by way of *Argumentation*; but by way of *Sentence*. And all *Judgment* is past upon the *justice* or *injustice* of the *Cause*, as the *Ratio sententiæ*. There was never Judg expressed *Rationem sententiæ* in plainer terms than Christ there doth. At least, methinks, the phrase in *Luke* 19. 17. should force you to confess this: *Because thou hast been faithful in a very little, have thou authority*, &c. If no plainness of speech will serve, it is in vain to cite Scripture. See also *Vers.* 27.

* But what is the *Ratio consequentiæ.*

9. Your seeming Argument for *Merit*, I have already overthrown, by subverting the grounds of it, here again recited.

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *CAn any more be said of Faith, than that we are justified and judged to life, both* [*for*] *it, and according to it?*

Animadvers.

1. I do not know how so much may be said of Faith, as that we are justified [for] it, though so much may be said; (for so much the Scripture saith) that we are justified by it.

2. [For] notes the formal or the meritorious Cause. [By] notes only the Instrument or the Condition.

3. The Scripture doth not shew that we are justified [by] Works, much less [for] them.

4. Though it shew that we must be judged, and receive our reward according to them.

5. It seems strange that you should so confound *secundum* and *propter*, when as *Gregory* so long ago so clearly distinguished them: *Aliud est secundum opera reddere, & aliud propter ipsa opera reddere.* Greg. in 7. poen. Psal. sive in Psal. 143. 8.

Reply.

1. I do not mean or say, that we are justified *Constitutivè* [for] Faith, as a Cause: nor that Faith is *Causa Regnandi*: But that God giveth this (our Faith and Obedience) as the *reason* of his absolving or justifying Sentence. And I offer you no other proof than the very expres words of Scripture: [*For I was hungry*;] and, [*Because thou hast been faithful.*] And in *Abraham*'s case in the very example that *James* brings to prove Justification by Works, it is said, [*Because thou hast done this, and hast not spared*, &c.] The reason why this is *Ratio judicii*, is because, *Lex est norma judicis: & quicquid Lex Conditionem præmii constituit, hoc ipsum est Ratio præmii adjudicandi.* The same thing may be *Causa sententiæ*; which is but *Conditio præmii adju-*

adjudicati. Justitia causæ est ratio Justificationis per sententiam judicis: Ideo enim hominem Justificat quia justus est: hoc est, quia causa ejus controversa justa est. Sed tamen hæc causa consistere potest in nudæ conditionis præstatione, quæ rei adjudicatæ causa propriè dicta, non est.

But indeed it is not [for] but [by] which we express a constitutive causation, whether formal or material.

2. [For] notes other causes than the formal or meritorious. In our case it noteth, *Rationem sententiæ, quæ est quasi causa impulsiva: Ut omnis justitia causæ est causa impulsiva judici ut reum absolvat.*

3. I marvel you say that the Scripture sheweth not that we are justified *by Works*; when you read Christ saying [*By thy words shalt thou be justified, and by thy words shalt thou be condemned*; and *James* 2. 24. *A man is justified by Works*, &c.]

4. [According to them,] is all one *in sensu forensi*, as [*by*] them.

5. I suppose by [*propter*] *Gregory* meant a *meritorious propter*, and so I agree with him. I never mentioned *propter*: The [*For*] that I speak of is [*enim*,] and not [*propter*.] It is *Matthews* [γὰρ,] and *Luke*'s [ὅτι] 19. 17.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *Works are not then considered as a mere sign, whereby God doth discern mens Faith: For he seeth it immediately, and needs no sign.*

Anim.

Animadverſ.

1. By this Reaſon you may as well *null* all the judicial proceedings deſcribed.

2. Yet I grant that Works are then conſidered as a part of the Condition: But not the Condition requiſite to Juſtification, though of the Condition requiſite to Glorification, and complete Salvation.

Reply.

1. If you had proved that all the judicial proceeding is upon *mere ſigns*, and the *ipſa cauſæ juſtitia* is not *meddled* with, then you might have better expected I ſhould receive your affirmation.

2. But why do you then *null* them all your ſelf, by yielding in the very next words, that Works are part of the Condition of Glorification, and ſo not mere ſigns.

3. Is it not an eaſie truth, that in that they are the *Conditions of Glorification*, they muſt needs be the *reaſon of juſtifying* that man who is accuſed to be *Reus pœnæ*, and to have *no right to Glorification*.

Aphoriſm.

Page 322. *IT ſeemeth that Chriſt doth call them Righteous, in reference to this perſonal Evangelical Righteouſneſs mentioned in their juſtifying Sentence*, verſ. 46. [the Righteous into Life Eternal.

Animadverſ.

1. I do not ſee why thoſe words ſhould be called the *juſtifying Sentence:* They rather ſhew how the Sentence before pronounced ſhould be executed.

2. Be it ſo that they are called Righteous, in reference to a perſonal Evangelical Righteouſneſs; yet it doth not follow that this perſonal Evangelical Righteouſneſs is ſuch, as that they are juſtified by it.

Reply.

Reply.

1. You strangely misunderstand my words, contrary to the plain sence of them, which is this, [*Christ in* Vers. 46. *doth call them Righteous, in reference to this personal Evangelical Righteousness mentioned in their justifying Sentence in the former Verses*, viz. [*I was hungry, and ye*, &c.] It is not *Vers.* 46. which I call the Sentence.

2. The whole scope of the Text shews, that they are justified by Love and Obedience, *ut per conditionem præstitam probatam:* The reading all that Chapter satisfies me so fully in that, that all the Arguments in the World, I think, will never make me question it.

Aphorism.

Page 324. *DOth not the contrary Doctrine needlessly constrain men to wrest most plain and frequent expressions of Scripture?*

Animadvers.

I see no expressions of Scripture that we are forced to wrest, by denying Works to justifie as well as Faith: But on the other side, to assert this is (so far as I can see) very repugnant to the Scripture.

Reply.

1. Your expressions may somewhat advantage your cause, in that the sound of the words, [*Justification by Works*] is harsh to them that hear not the words explained. I do no not use that phrase; but rather say thus, that [*our Justification is continued and consummate by Sentence at Judgment, not only by Faith, but by Love, Hope, Repentance, sincere Obedience to the Redeemer, and God in him, as secondary parts of the Conditions of the New-Covenant.*] *James* and *Paul* took not *Works* in the same sense. *Paul* meant

meant by *Works*, *opera meritoria operarii*, or done with a *conceit* of *Merit*; such as *make the reward to be not of Grace, but of Debt*: *James* meant none such, but onely *Obedience* to *God-Redeemer*. If you demand my proof (as some have done) I give it you: The Works that *James* speaks of are necessary to Justification, or *(teipso fatente)* to *Salvation*: But the *Works* that *Paul* speaks of, no Christian must dare to think of performing; viz. *Such as make the reward to be of Debt, and not of Grace*. Now to deny Justification by *Obedience*, in the sense explained, forceth men to wrest multitudes of plain Scripture-Texts: Review them and judg.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *Doth it not uphold that dangerous Pillar of Antinomian Doctrine, that we must not work or perform duty* for *Life and Salvation, but only* from Life *and* Salvation?

Animadvers.

It is one thing to work for *Life* and *Salvation*, that is, the bliss and happiness of the Life to come; another thing to work for *Justification*, or that we may be justified: The Scriptures teach us as well to deny this, as to assert the other.

Reply.

Speaking of Meritorious or Legal working, I yield that Scripture is against the conceit of it: But of working in our sense, I reply, 1. Shew me *ubi Lex ita distinguit*? 2. Did not I before attempt to prove, that Salvation and Justification at Judgment have the same Conditions? and I did not discern that you plainly denied it, else I should there have further proved it. 3. Devise if you can, any way to justifie a man that is accused to be *Reus pœnæ*, and

and his *title to the Reward denied*, but by justifying his title, and proving that he hath fulfilled the Condition, or is pardoned for *non*-fulfilling. For not-fulfilling the *Conditions* of the *first Law*, we must plead *Pardon* or *Satisfaction* made: But for not fulfilling the *Conditions* of the second *Covenant* there is *no pardon*: It is therefore the fulfilling them it self that must so justifie.

Aphorism.

Page 325. NOw if *Good-works*, or *sincere Obedience to Christ our Lord, be no part of the Condition of our full Justification and Salvation, who will use them to that end?*

Animadverf.

There is not the like Reason of Justification and Salvation: For Salvation is wrought by degrees; it's begun here, and perfected hereafter. We are saved by Hope, *Rom.* 8. 24. *And we must work out our own Salvation with fear and trembling*, Phil. 2. 12. It is not so in respect of Justification. It hath no degrees in it self, though it hath in the Manifestation of it. For it is a freedom from all sin, in respect of Imputation, and from all Condemnation for sin, *Acts* 13. 39. *Rom.* 8. 1. Salvation is so perfected hereafter, as that some part of it is added, and that the chief part which before was wanting: But Justification is only so perfected, as that the perfection of it is made manifest, and Satan with all other Accusers is for ever put to silence.

Reply.

1. As one good act may *cause another in our selves*, so there is not the *same Reason* between Justification, and that part of Salvation. For that is but the *Condition* of one, which is the *Cause* of the other. But as *Salvation* is the *gift of God*, so there is the *same Reason* of obtaining *right to Justification* and to *Salvation*. They are two distinct *Dues*, flowing

flowing from the *same Covenant*, upon our *union to Christ*, upon the *same Condition* on our part. And the immediate right of possession at Judgment is the same on the same Conditions.

2. I have said enough to this. [*Freedom*] is here ambiguous: Either you mean active Liberation, or passive: If the latter, either you mean a certainty, that we shall not be condemned; or you mean, *non-Condemnation* at present; or you mean *right to Absolution per judicem*; or else *Absolution passive it self*. The Reprobate here are *non-condemnati per sententiam judicis*, though *per Legem* they are *condemned already*. The *Elect* from the foundations of the World were sure *(certitudine objecti)* to be *absolved*; yet were not then freed perfectly. *Right to Absolution* is perfect *pro præsenti in se*, as is the *right* of a Tenant in his house, when he hath taken his Lease; But it is not perfect *pro tempore futuro*: Because, 1. More Conditions are to be performed. 2. More sins to be pardoned. If you mean it of *actual judicial Absolution*, you are not so perfectly freed in this Life.

1. Where there is not the *active Absolution*, there is not the passive: But the *active Absolution judicial per sententiam*, either is not at all in this life, or is not perfect; therefore, *&c.* *Apologetical* Justification hath degrees: And *Sentential* is the most perfect kind.

2. Justification is opposite to Condemnation: But *Condemnation* is not perfect (if properly any at all) till the Judgment; therefore Justification is not perfect till then. *Condemnatio Legis est tantum virtualis, ut respicit judicium.*

3. Your

3. Your Doctrine is plain Antinomian, if by [*freedom from all sin,*] you mean all *future sin*, as you seem to do. Sin is not pardoned, which is no sin, that is, which is not *yet committed: Reatus qui nondum contrahitur, non dissolvitur.*

4. You suppose Justification *per sententiam judicis*, to be no Justification, but a Manifestation of it: When our Divines still say, the word is to be used *in sensu judiciario.* And I have far much more ado with Mr. *L.* (an excellent Politician) to prove, that *constitutive Justification* is so to be *called.* He thinks only *sentential Justification* is true Justification; you think it's *none*: But I think both *Constitutive* and *Sentential*, are truly and properly Justification. *Sententia judicis, vel Condemnationem, vel Absolutionem continet: (Et non tantum Condemnationis, vel Absolutionis Manifestationem.)* Zouch. Jurisprud. par. 5. sect. 10, *&c.* You'll spoil all your Law, if you confound *Jus & Judicium.* A Woman may as fully *manifest* a Felony or Murther, and the dueness of punishment, as the *Judge*; and yet the man shall not for that be executed. The Civil Law saith, that *Judicis decretum requiritur etiam in manifeste prodigo.* Mynsing. in Institut. l. 1. tit. 23. pag. 115.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *Whether this Doctrine doth not tend to drive Obedience out of the World: For if men once believe, that it is not so much as a part of the Condition of their Justification, will it not much tend to relax their diligence?*

Anim.

Animadverſ.

No: If they conſider as they ought to do, that though Obedience do not concur with Faith as a Joynt-condition of our Juſtification, yet it is a neceſſary fruit of that Faith whereby we are juſtified.

Reply.

Obſcure ſtill. Do you mean [*Neceſſary*] *neceſſitate Præcepti* only, or *neceſſitate Medii* alſo? If the former, we may be ſaved without it; or elſe *every ſinner* muſt periſh. If the latter, *what means* can it be lower than a *Condition?* If you ſhould mean it, *non de neceſſitate morali ſed naturali*, that requires not our care or diligence.

Aphoriſm.

Page 326. *DOth it not much confirm the World in their Soul-cozening Faith?*

Animadverſ.

It is not the Doctrine that doth it, but the abuſe of the Doctrine; ſome being apt *to turn the Grace of God into laſciviouſneſs*, Jude, *v.* 4. How do they confirm the World in their Soul-cozening Faith, who teach, That we are juſtified by receiving Chriſt for our Saviour: But yet teach withal, that none can have him for their Saviour, except they take him for their Lord alſo? The beſt Doctrine may be abuſed: The abuſe is to be prevented or reformed; but the Doctrine it ſelf is not to be deſerted. See *Rom.* 5.20. with 6. 1,14,15.

Reply.

The Doctrine it ſelf I think is guilty of it: For when you have denied [*Taking Chriſt for Lord*] to have the *neceſſity* of a *Condition* (or Cauſe) and then ſay, it is *neceſſary* for all that; you either con-

tradict your self, or you mean no such *Moral necessity*, but that a man may be saved without it. Nay, you say, that men are *first justified* by taking Christ as *Priest*, and *after* take him for King: And so a *Christ-dividing Faith*, which is *no true Faith*, should justifie, and the taking him as King should not be necessary *ne quoad præsentiam*. And when you have taught wicked men, that it justifieth them to accept of Christ as Priest, to justifie and save them, and they *are willing of that* unfeignedly, will you make them believe they are *unjustified again*, because the accepting Christ as King doth not follow it? Or will you shew them why they are not justified, when neither Cause nor Condition is wanting? What an effect is that which will not be produced, when there is all the Causes and Conditions?

Why is it that *accepting Christ as King* must of *necessity* follow? All *necessity* hath *some Reason*. And if you would perswade either them or me, that they do *not accept* of Christ's *Satisfaction* to *justifie* them (which you say is the Condition) and that they do but dissemble, neither they nor I can believe you. *They feel* the contrary, and *I know it*. I never knew man in my life that was unwilling to be pardoned and justified, or willing to be damned. Indeed properly it cannot be called [*Acceptance*,] because that presupposeth an *offer*: And Christ as Priest only, is offered to none, but a willingness so to have him it is.

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Page 327. *Surely the easiness of the former; (viz. to expect Justification from Christ alone:) and the difficulty of the latter; (viz. to take Christ for Lord) seemeth to tell us, that it is a spiritual, excellent, necessary part of justifying Faith.*

Animadvers.

Perhaps for [*spiritual*] should be [*special:*] But however, 1. It doth not appear to be so easie a thing to expect Justification from Christ alone: The Jews of old were averse from it, *Rom.* 9. 31, 32. and so are the Papists generally at this day, and others also besides them. 2. I see not how there is more difficulty in taking Christ for our Lord, if we make it a part of justifying Faith, than if we make it (as I suppose we should) a *fruit* of it.

Reply.

[Spiritual] for [special] was a misprinting; a thing very frequent in that Book. 1. You might perceive that I speak not of the difficulty of *assenting to the truth* of Christ's *Priestly Office*, but of the *Wills Consent* or *Acceptance*, supposing the *Assent*. It is as difficult for the *Understanding to believe Christ's Priestly Office*, as his *Kingly:* The Jews believed neither. I never met with a Papist, but would say, He trusted only in the Merits of Christ; therefore they be not generally at this day, so bad in this as they are made. *Rivet* saith (and so do many more of our Divines, citing the same passage, as *Amef.* &c.) that the Jesuites themselves admit, *Rectam esse nostram sententiam, si intelligamus nobis imputari Christi merita, quia nobis donata sunt, &*

possimus ea Deo patri offerre pro nostris peccatis, quoniam Christus suscepit per se onus satisfaciendi pro nobis, nosq; Deo Patri reconciliandi. They are *Bellarmine's* words, *Lib. 2. de Justif. c. 7.* And *Rivet* adds, [*Quæ certe nostra est ex parte sententia, quanquam aliam nobis affingat de justitia Christi tanquam causa formali.* Riv. Disp. 10. de fide Justif. §. 13. p. 190. And *Vignerius* and other Papists ordinarily say, that *Man's Works are not necessary to supply any defect in Christ's Satisfaction (for it is perfect) but only for the application of it to our selves.* And how many of them deny *Merit*, in sense, you know: Yet I excuse none of their errours.

But that which I speak of is the compleat act of *justifying Faith in the Will:* When men *believe* Christ to be the *Mediator*, and his *Word* to be *true*, (which wicked men may do, seeing the Devils do it) it is not then so hard a matter to make them *willing* to take him for their *Justifier*, as to take him for their *Ruler*. I know there is in man a natural Pride, by which he would be beholden to none. But when men are convinced that they are sinners, and they cannot pardon themselves, nor any save them but Christ; I think it is no hard matter to make them willing that Christ should pardon and save them. I say again, *No man can be willing to be damned* or *unpardoned*, that knows these. I know never a wicked man about me, but is willing to be pardoned and saved by Christ.

2. I am fully of your mind in your second note: but I know not to what purpose it was. I think it is less difficult to take Christ for our Lord, when we know it to be the *Condition of Pardon* (for then

then we have a potent *motive* to it) then when we say, *It is no such Condition* (and so lose our motive:) Yet Natures averseness is a-like to the thing it self; but that in one respect we have God's means to overcome it, and not in the other.

If taking Christ for Lord, be but *a fruit* of justifying Faith; then, 1. We are justified *before* it, that is, before we take Christ as Christ. 2. And then it would have done well if you had shewed the *Moral necessity* of that fruit? what it is, if not a *Condition*? and why a man may not be saved without it. He that is justified, is in a state of Salvation (say you, truly;) and therefore should be saved, if he so died: But he that only taketh Christ for Priest, say you, is justified: (for the fruit followeth the Cause) therefore he should be saved, *&c.*

Aphorism.

Page 329. *IS not this excluding of* sincere Obedience *from* Justification; *The great stumbling-block of Papists, and that which hath had a great hand in turning many Learned men from the Protestant Religion to Popery?*

Animadvers.

So the preaching of Christ crucified, and of Justification through Faith in him, was the great stumbling-block of the Jews, 1 *Cor.* 1. 23. *Rom.* 9. 31, 32. Yet the Apostle preached and pressed this Doctrine for all that: and so must we, though the Papists be offended at it: *Melius enim est ut scandalum oriatur, quam ut veritas relinquatur.* Bernard. Epist. 34.

Reply.

The Question is, of *Scandal given:* The Answer is of *Scandal taken.* The Question is of *Scandal by Errour*: The Answer is of *Scandal by the Truth. Paul*'s Doctrine did set up the Lord *Jesus Christ* against *man's Works*; but not *Jesus* against or without the *Lord Christ*, nor one *single act* of *man's* (*Faith*) against *other acts*; (as Love) about the same Object. This was the Jews offence, which is far from that Question: They were not offended that one act of man was advanced above all the rest; (for *Paul* did not that, it was none of his design to advance Faith above Love, *&c.*) but that Christ was advanced against their own supposed Legal Righteousness, (which was *Paul*'s work: Nor did *Paul* lay all on the *Instrumentality* or *natural use* of Faith; (*viz.* that it is *Apprehensio Christi*, *i. e. fides*:) as if it justified but in a *natural* consideration, and not in a *moral*: Nor yet did he ascribe Justification to *Affiance* as the sole act, excluding *ab officio Assent* and *Acceptance*, nor to any one of these alone.

Aphorism.

Page 330,331, *DO these men think, that we are perfectly justified and saved already?*

Animadverf.

Perfectly justified, I think, we are already, though not perfectly saved. If sin be not, and Righteousness be imputed to us, and we are freed from all Condemnation (and so it is with us if we are true Believers) then we are perfectly justified.

Reply

Reply.

To this I have ſpoke oft enough. If you are ſo perfectly juſtified, then you need no more Juſtification. But you need more: 1. You need that the New-Law or Covenant ſhould juſtifie you every day. In Teſtaments, Laws, *&c.* the act as continued, is as truly an act as the firſt. 2. You need that Chriſt ſhould juſtifie you *per Apologiam* now. 3. And at *Judgment*. 4. And *per ſententiam* then.

Aphoriſm.

THis *Doctrine was offenſive to* Melancthon, Bucer, *and other moderate Divines.*

Animadverſ.

What Doctrine? that of Juſtification by Faith without Works? Where do they take offence at it? *Bellarmine* (as I have noted before) doth cite *Melancthon* among others, as teaching that Faith alone doth juſtifie, though Faith, which juſtifieth, be not alone, but accompanied with good Works. And if *Bucer* had taught otherwiſe, *Bellarmine* would have been ſure to have found it out, and to have told us of it. B. *Davenant* notes it as a calumny of the Papiſts, that none of our Writers, except *Bucer* and *Chemnitius*, do acknowledg any inherent Righteouſneſs in thoſe that are juſtified. *Omnes* (*enim*) *agnoſcimus* (ſaith he) *& clare profitemur Deum infundere hujuſmodi juſtitiam in ipſo actu juſtificandi; ſed negamus ſententiam Dei Juſtificantis ad hanc reſpicere tanquam ad cauſam, per quam homo Juſtificatus conſtituitur.* Dav. de Juſt. Hab. c. 22. p. 312. If perhaps you mean that *Melancthon*, *Bucer*, and others, took offence at the Doctrine of *Illyricus*, and ſome others, who accounted it Here-

sie to say, that Good-works are necessary to Salvation, as you say they did, *page* 329. I answer, It is one thing to say, that Good-works are necessary to Salvation; another thing to say, that they are necessary to Justification. For Justification must go before Good-works, such as are not only good in themselves, but also good as done by us: But Good-works must go before Salvation, I mean the full and perfect accomplishment of it.

Reply.

I mean the Doctrine of them that deny Obedience to be a Condition of Salvation, or of final Justification at Judgment, and so by denying the *grounds* of their *necessity*, bring men to wicked lives. I suppose in this speech the truth of *Thesis* 78. that our full Justification, and our Glorification, have on our part the same Conditions; and therefore for all you say, it is a denying both, or granting both consequentially, to deny or grant one. I doubt *Illyricus* Doctrine was the same in sense with this: For he denied not *Good-works* to be *necessary* (as at large you may see in *Schlusselburgius contra Majoristas*;) but that they were *necessary to Justification or Salvation*, that is, he thought them (as you speak) necessary fruits of Faith; but not *necessary means*, (i. e. *Conditions*) of *Salvation*.

For *Bucer*, I suppose, you have read what passed between *Rivet* and *Grotius* about him. See also *Colloq. Ratisbon. p.* 302,308,313,567. *Illud solum in quæstione de Mercede bonorum operum controversum est, An sit in bonis operibus renatorum aliquod meritum condignum Mercede, quam eis Deus retribuit? Nam vitam æternam reddi fidelibus bene operantibus,*

bus, etiam Coronæ & Mercedis loco, nos semper dedimus.

For *Melanct. vid. Apolog. pro Confess. August. in Art.* 20. *& in Operum Tom.* 2. *loc. de Bonis Oper. Nova obedientia est necessaria, necessitate ordinis, causæ, & effectûs: item necessitate debiti seu mandati. Item necessitate retinendæ fidei —— & vitandi pœnas temporales & æternas.* Et in Epist. Lugd. edit. 1647. p. 453. he contends, that to speak exactly *Agnitio peccatorum* is not *causa secunda Remissionis* (that Mercy is the sole efficient neareſt cause:) But it is *causa sine qua non*; and makes that to be his usual phrase. And that's as much as I; for that's a *Condition of Remission.* Vid. & Epist. 19. p. 455. & p. 438. *Cordatus urbem, vicinas etiam Regiones, & ipsam aulam adversus me concitat, propterea quod in explicanda controversia Justificationis, dixi novam obedientiam necessariam esse ad salutem*, &c. And *page* 446. he adviseth to preach the *praises* of Good-works rather in *Sermons of Repentance*, because he observed that many of ours would bear the *same Doctrine there*, which they would not in the point of *Justification.* See also *Camerar.* and *Melch. Adamus* in his Life.

Davenant's words cited, have nothing that I dislike (but only that Grace is said to be infused *in ipso actu Justificandi*, when the acts are of various natures: But I suppose he means, *de tempore* only. The rest is before oft replied to.

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Page 332. *Works (or a purpose to walk with God)* saith Mr. *Ball* on the Covenant, *page 73.) do justifie, as the passive Qualification of the subject capable of Justification.*

Animadvers.

But you leave out the words which Mr. *Ball* immediately addeth to explain himself the better; viz. [*Or as the Qualification of that Faith that justifieth, or as they testifie and give proof that Faith is lively: But Faith alone justifieth, as it embraceth the free promise of free forgiveness in Jesus Christ.* And in the very same page, Mr. *Ball* hath these words, which are as expres against you as may be: [*So that we may conclude from this passage of holy Writ, that* Abraham *was justified by Faith alone: But this his Faith though alone in the act of Justification, no other Grace working with it, was not alone* in existence, *did not lie dead in him, as a dormant and idle Quality.*

Reply.

1. I left out all the rest of his Book too: But the Reader may see all at pleasure.

2. Doth that you add gain-say what I cited? If not, take it in as favourable a sense to you as the words will bear.

3. I allow also of the explicatory terms (as you judg them to be) which you add.

4. But I never undertook to shew, that Mr. *Ball* and I were just of a judgment in this point: But only that he gives as much as I do to Works (and more;) but more than I do to Faith. He yieldeth both

both *Faith* and *Works* to be the *Condition of Justification* (which is the thing that you deny;) but he affirmeth Faith to be moreover the *instrumental Cause* of Justification (which you will not own any more than I.) Lest you think I wrong him, see *page* 20. [*A disposition to Good-works is necessary to Justification, being the Qualification of an active and lively Faith: Good-works of all sorts are necessary to our continuance in the state of Justification, and so to our final Absolution, if God give opportunity. But they are not the cause of, but only a precedent Qualification* or *Condition to final forgiveness, and to eternal bliss. If then, when we speak of the Conditions of the Covenant of Grace, by* [*Condition*] *we understand whatsoever is required on our part, as precedent, concomitant, or subsequent to Justification; Repentance, Faith and Obedience are all Conditions: But if by* [*Condition*] *we understand what is required on our part as the cause of the good promised, though only instrumental; Faith or Belief in the promises of free-mercy, is the only Condition.*

So *page* 21. [*This* walking in the Light, as he is in the Light, *is that Qualification whereby we become immediately capable of Christ's Righteousness, or actual Participants of his Propitiation, which is the sole immediate cause of our Justification, taken for remission of sins, or actual approbation with God.*] This is more than I say.

Aphorism.

See *Calvin* on *Luke* 1. 6.

Anim.

Animadverſ.

I can ſee nothing there for you; but ſomething againſt you, [*Juſti ergo & irreprehenſibiles cenſentur quoniam tota vita teſtatur eos Juſtitiæ addictos eſſe*, &c. *Sed quia à perfectione longe diſtat pium eorum ſtudium, non poteſt ſine venia placere Deo. Quare juſtitia quæ in illis laudatur, à gratuita Dei indulgentia pendet; qua fit, ut quod reliquum eſt, in ipſis injuſtitiæ, non imputet. Sic exponere neceſſe eſt quicquid de hominum juſtitia in Scripturis habetur, ut remiſſionem peccatorum non evertat; cui non aliter innititur, quam ſuo fundamento ædificium.* Here *Calvin*, 1. Denies perſonal Righteouſneſs to be perfect, and ſuch, as without pardoning mercy can pleaſe God. 2. He makes this perſonal Righteouſneſs to follow Juſtification, and to relie upon it, as a building doth on its foundation: Therefore according to *Calvin* in this place (for his judgment in this point is otherwiſe well known) perſonal Righteouſneſs is not that whereby we are juſtified.

Reply.

I own all that which you judg againſt me. And to your Obſervations, 1. So do I deny perſonal Righteouſneſs to be *materially perfect*, and in divers other reſpects mentioned in the Aphoriſm. All that *Calvin* drives at is, that it is a *Righteouſneſs* that ſtands with ſin and pardon, which who dare deny? But did *Calvin* deny the Metaphyſical *perfection of Being*, as to the *Relation* of [*Righteous*,] or yet the Relation of [*præſtitor conditionis novæ Legis*,] whereon it is grounded?

2. So do I ſay, that this *Righteouſneſs follows Juſtification*, and receives much of its force from it, (that the perſon be reconciled:) But yet may it not go *before* it *quoad continuationem & ſententiam judicis?*

judicis ? Calvin maintaineth a true personal Righteousness, consisting with necessity of pardon of sin, and so do I. His main Caution is, that we feign not any Righteousness inconsistent with pardon; and that who doth not abhor? Your Conclusion therefore is merely your own.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *THe common Assertion, that [Good-works do follow Justification, and not go before it,] must be thus understood, or it is false*; viz. *Actual Obedience goeth not before the first moment of Justification*, &c.

Animadverf.

By this which you here grant it follows, that Justification is by Faith alone, without Works; though they also will follow in their time and order.

Reply.

True: If you mean it of external Works, and of the beginning of Justification. Do you need to tell me of a Consequence, which I so oft professedly maintain, as if it followed against my mind? But as this excludes not Repentance, Love to Christ, *&c.* from our first Justification; so nor outward Works from the continued and sentential Justification at Judgment, as Conditions of both.

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *But yet it is as true,* 1. *That the taking Christ for our Lord, and so delivering up our selves to his Government (which is the subjection of the heart, and resolution for further Obedience, and indeed an essential part of Faith) doth in order of nature go before our first Justification.*

Animadvers.

1. *Viz.* As the Qualification of that Faith which justifies, as Mr. *Ball* in the place before cited speaks.

2. But Christ as having satisfied for our sins, is received by us unto Justification.

3. Faith which justifieth, doth receive Christ in respect of all his Offices: But Faith justifieth as it receiveth Christ as a Priest, making satisfaction for us; by which Satisfaction laid hold on by Faith, and so imputed to us, we are justified.

Reply.

1. I yield to your first from Mr. *Ball* (as to those acts that are not essential;) but have proved already, that the *Qualification* of Faith is *part of the Condition*, and so it hath the *necessity-moral* of a *Condition* (as *current English money* in a Bond:) And not only a *natural necessity* (as it is necessary an entire man have *two hands*, &c.) The Condition is, not only that we *Believe*, but that we *affectionately believe*, &c.

2. I yet see no reason to think, *Taking Christ as King to be less essential to justifying Faith*, than taking him

him as Priest. Your second Proposition is true, but nothing against me.

3. And the same I say of the next, [*Faith justifieth as it receiveth Christ as Priest,*] except you add [*only.*]

4. That which mars all your discourse is, 1. The confounding two Questions, *What justifieth* ex parte objecti? and what *ex parte actus nostri?* It is Christ's *Satisfaction*, and not his *Kingship* that justifieth *meritoriously*; it is Christ as *Advocate* that *justifies Apologetically*; it is *Christ as Judg* that *justifies Sententially*: As it is Christ (and the Father in him) that *per novum fœdus*, justifieth Constitutively *efficienter*. But *ex parte actus*, *Faith* justifieth *quatenus conditio istius fœderis:* And that Faith which is the *Condition*, is the receiving our Lord Jesus Christ the Redeemer entirely.

2. You are brought to confess, that Faith is the *Condition of Justification* (and I think that it justifies *qua conditio præstita*) and yet you seem to retain a notion in your mind, as if it *justified qua fides* in its *natural Capacity:* As if the *Ratio materialis vel Aptitudinalis*, were nearer the effect than the *Formalis*.

Aphorism.

Ibid. 2. *That actual Obedience, as part of the Condition, doth in order of nature go before our Justification as continued and confirmed.*

Animadverf.

Justification is not continued nor confirmed, without actual Obedience; yet Justification is continued by the continuance of Faith, though this continuance of Faith, and so of Justification, be not without the co-existence of actual Obedience, which Obedience doth make for the confirmation of Faith, and so of our Justification, as being a proof and evidence of that Faith by which we are justified.

Reply.

Here is nothing against me: For want of the word [*Only*] after [*Continuance of Faith:*] Which if you meant, I have given my Reasons against it before, and am ready to do it much more fully, as being a point that I am confident in.

Aphorism.

Page 313. 3. *That perseverance in faithful Obedience, doth both in nature and time go before our full, compleat and final Justification; and that as a part of the Condition of obtaining it:* If we walk in the Light, *&c.* 1 *John* 1.7. *Isa.* 1. 16, 17. Ezek. 33. 14, 15, 16. & 18. 21, 22.

Animadverf.

Our Justification (as I have often noted before) is full here, though it be not fully manifested till hereafter. The places of Scripture which you alledg, speak of Justification as it is here obtained; and they shew *who* are justified, not *by what* they are justified.

Reply.

Reply.

1. I have oft enough told you, that this is your great errour: As if Justification were only *unius generis*, and *sentential* were *none*.

2. If those Texts speak but *de nudis signis*, any Antinomian may as well say the like of any Text you shall bring for Faith's justifying. I know they speak not of *Causes*, but they speak plainly of Conditions.

Aphorism.

In *Append.* page 120. *IS not Faith a work or act of ours?*

Animadverf.

It is not the act of Faith apprehending, but the Object or thing apprehended, *viz.* Christ's Righteousness, which doth formally justifie. Only Faith or Believing is said to justifie, because Christ's Righteousness, except it be apprehended by Faith, is not available to our Justification. Something before out of B. *Davenant* I have cited to this purpose, to which I add that which he saith *de Just. Hab. cap.* 28. *page* 371. *Nihil usitatius quam causæ applicanti illud tribuere, quod propriè & immediatè pertinet ad rem applicatam. Quia igitur fides apprehendit & applicat nobis Christi justitiam, id fidei ipsi tribuitur quod reapse Christo debetur.*

Reply.

1. If indeed this be your meaning, that it is not *Faith* by which we are justified at all, but *Christ*, the Dispute is vain, *How Faith justifies?* and *Whe-*

ther Faith alone? if be *not Faith* at all. What have we done all this while? But I cannot believe that when you say, [*Faith justifies as a Condition*, or *Apprehension*, or (as others say) as an *Instrument*,] that by [*Faith* is meant [*Christ*,] as if *he* were the *Condition*, *Apprehension* and *Instrument*.

2. I am not of your mind, that *Christ's Righteousness* doth *formally* justifie; but rather, *meritoriously* or *materially*. Remember the place which I cited even now out of *Rivet* where he blames *Bellarmine* for fastening your conceit on us.

3. Is it not utter obscurity to say, [*Believing is said to justifie, only because Christ's Righteousness, except apprehended*, &c.] Oh that you had told me here what the *moral Office* or *Interest* of Faith is in this work! and why Christ's Righteousness cannot justifie without apprehension? I know but two Opinions that are worth the mentioning: Some say, [*Because Faith is an Instrument*;] or as others, that see the impropriety of this, [*Because it is* conditio naturaliter necessaria, *as the hands taking a Pearl*;] and not *moraliter ex constitutione donantis*. This Opinion I have by very many Arguments confuted in another place. 2. That it is of *natural convenience*, and *moral necessity*. It would have been inconvenient to have given Remission upon Christ's Satisfaction to any without Faith; yet God could have done it, had he pleased, and removed some causes of the inconveniency. But the immediate Reason of Faith's interest, is, that the Donor hath made it the Condition. This is my Judgment, which I have fullier elsewhere explained and proved. *Davenant*'s words are not against me.

Anim.

Animadverſ.

Manton on *James* 2. 23. [For thoſe great Diſputes about the matter of Juſtification, I would not intermeddle, let it ſuffice to note, That the general current of *Paul's* Epiſtles carrieth it for the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt; which being imputed to us, maketh us juſt and acceptable before God; and this Righteouſneſs we receive by Faith. So that Faith juſtifieth not in the Popiſh ſenſe, as a moſt perfect Grace, or as a good Work done by us; but in it's relation to Chriſt, as it receiveth Chriſt's ſatisfactory Righteouſneſs, And ſo whether you ſay it juſtifieth as an Inſtrument, a ſole working Inſtrument, or as an Ordinance or Relative Action required on our part, all is to the ſame iſſue and purpoſe. To contend about mere words, and bare forms of ſpeech, is to be too preciſe and critical.

Reply.

To Mr. *Manton* I ſay, 1. If it be all one whether we ſay, An Inſtrument, an Ordinance, or Relative Action required on our parts, then I much differ not from you: For I dare call it ſo, [*A Relative Act required on our parts.*] But,

2. I conceive that [*A Relative Act*] is a dark Expreſſion: *What Relation* hath it to Chriſt? doth it juſtifie *qua related* to Chriſt? then why do not many other acts related to Chriſt juſtifie? For my part, I think, when the nature of *Faith*, and of *Juſtification*, and of a *Condition*, is well underſtood, it will appear that we have no proper name in uſe to expreſs the *Formalem Rationem* of Faith's intereſt in Juſtification, but the term [*Condition,*] as it is uſed by Lawyers; or, *Cauſa ſine qua non, & cum quâ, ex neceſſitate morali.*

3. Do not those contend about words (and mistaking ones) that contend so much for Faith's *Instrumentality* in justifying? Words must be fitted to things. It is far from a mere contention about words, in the sense as I use it: Whether it be receiving Christ only *as Priest* that *justifieth?* is a material Question; and so are many more that follow.

Animadvers.

Præceptum & prohibitio ad Voluntatem præcipientem: operatio autem & permissio ad voluntatem decernentem pertinent. Trigland. de Volunt. Dei, p. 159. *Præceptum (quo Deus* Abrahamo *præcepit, ut filium suum immolaret) erat signum, non voluntatis decernentis, quasi Deus decrevisset quid certò fieri deberet, cujus per signum est operatio Divina, & ex illa rei eventus: Sed voluntatis exigentis, & hujus verum erat & indubitatum signum: Verè enim & seriò Deus ab* Abrahamo *exigebat, ut adeo se mortigerum ei exhiberet, & vel unigenito suo filio ipsius causâ non parceret.* Trigland. ibid. p. 161.

Voluntas signi (as Precept, or Prohibition, or Operation, or Permission is so called) is not properly *Voluntas*, but only *signum Voluntatis*; yet there is a *Voluntas* of which those are signs; viz. *Voluntas præcipiens*, the signs whereof are Precept and Prohibition; and *Voluntas decernens*, the signs whereof are Operation and Permission.

Reply.

I am glad to see *Triglandius* speak the same as I do, and that you in your following words exactly agree with me in that point; asserting both a proper *immanent Will de Debito*, distinct from that *de Eventu*; and a *signal Will de Debito*, metonymically so called.

I came but even now from heaping up forty Testimonies of our Divines that speak as I, and am loth to do that work again, unless it were more useful: But I remember I promised you something of *Davenant*'s, because you oft mention him: And it is not any Sentences on the by, but his judgment fully and purposely delivered in Propositions, with their proof, how far Good-works are necessary. De Justit. Habit & Act. c.30. p.384. [1. *Bona opera sunt necessaria omnibus fidelibus & Justificatis, qui habent usum rationis & per ætatem operari possunt.*] *Lege sequentia.* Et cap.31. p.403. Concluf.5. [*Bona quædam opera sunt necessaria ad Justificationem, ut conditiones concurrentes vel præcursoriæ, licet non sint necessariæ ut causæ efficientes aut meritoriæ*] *Lege probat.* Concluf. 6. p. 404. *Bona opera sunt necessaria ad Justificationis statum retinendum & conservandum; Non ut causæ quæ per se efficiant aut mereantur hanc conservationem: Sed ut media seu conditiones, sine quibus Deus non vult Justificationis gratiam in hominibus conservare.*] Vide probat. seq. Concluf. 7. p. 405. *Bona opera Justificatorum sunt ad salutem necessaria necessitate ordinis, non causalitatis: Vel planius, ut via ordinata ad vitam æternam, non ut causæ meritoriæ vitæ æternæ.* Vid. & pag. 570,571, 572, 633.

You may see here, if you will be of *Davenant*'s mind, you must be of mine in this: He gives to Works the very same Office as I do, neither more nor less. If he do give any more than I to *Faith*, (as he doth in calling it an *Instrument*; but I

think it is Metaphorically only that he means) that is all the difference. I undertake to manifest, that our greatest Divines ordinarily give to Works as much as I: But indeed I give not to *Faith* (and to *man*) so much as they; not daring to make man his own Justifier and Pardoner, or his *Act* to be the *Instrument* of *God's Act* of justifying, or of producing the same effect. Who can forgive sins but God only? If he have any Instruments, it is his *Gospel* properly, and his *Ministers remotely*, and less properly.

Finitur, Jun. 18. 1652.

Postscript.

TO the two Great Points in difference, let me speak this word more:

1. Those that make Faith to justifie as an *Instrument*, or as *Apprehensio Christi*, do set up the τὸ *Credere* which they cry down. For that which they call *Instrumentality*, is the *Apprehensive Act*: And *Apprehendere* and *Credere* are here all one; and therefore if the *Apprehension* of Christ justifieth *qua Apprehensio*, or *qua Acceptatio*, then the τὸ *Credere qua talis* justifies.

2. And those that teach this Doctrine, do contradict themselves in saying, that

Paul excludes *all Works*; becauſe Faith (ſay they) juſtifieth not *as a Work:* For to juſtifie *qua Inſtrumentum vel qua Apprehenſio Chriſti*, is to juſtifie as a *Work*, or as *this Work*. For they cannot ſpeak *de Inſtrumenti materia:* For, 1. Faith (the act) can be no *material* Inſtrument. 2. The whole formal nature of inſtrumental Cauſe, lieth in its actual Application by the principal cauſe: And before that Application it is only an Aptitudinal Inſtrument, or apt to be an Inſtrument; but is not one formally and indeed. Now the Cauſation of Inſtruments is *per Operationem vel Actionem*: And therefore if Faith juſtifie as an *Inſtrumental Cauſe*, then it muſt needs juſtifie as *Opus* or *Actio*.

3. And ſo this Doctrine ſets up Juſtification by Works, againſt which the Authors ſeem ſo zealous: (The unhappy fate of many Errours, to ſet up what they are the extream oppoſers of;) and that in an unlawful ſenſe: For it makes the formal reaſon of Faith's juſtifying to be *its Apprehenſion*, that is, that it is *ſuch an Action*; or its *Inſtrumentality*, which is *an Operation*. Whereas I only affirm (with Scripture) that Obedience

Obedience to Christ justifies, not *qua Obedience*, or *qua Opus*, but as the *Condition* to which the free Lawgiver hath been pleased to annex Justification.

2. Against yours (and the common) conceit, [That there is such a difference between *Justification* and *right to Salvation*, that Faith alone procures one, and Works concur to the other.] Besides all that I have said, let me desire you to observe, that *Paul* speaks as fully and directly of *right to Salvation*, as of *Justification*; and *excludes Works* as much (and more) from the one as from the other.

1. *Rom.* 3. 23, 24. *Justification freely by Grace*, is opposed to [*coming short of the Glory of God.*]

2. *Rom.* 4. 4. *Paul* expressly speaks of [the *Reward given of Grace, and not of Debt*;] and therefore excludeth those Works. But, 1. *Savaltion* is the *Reward* as well as *Justification*; and therefore this Reason equally excludeth Works from *saving* as from *justifying*. 2. Yea, if their Doctrine

Doctrine were true, that say it is *only Salvation*, and not *Pardon* and *Justification*, that is given *per modum premii*, as a *Reward*, then this Text would not concern Justification at all, but only *Salvation*. (But doubtless it doth concern Justification also; and therefore this is another good Argument, that Faith justifieth not *qua Instrumentum vel Apprehensio, proxime, sed qua Conditio præstita*, because Justification is given as a Reward; and *Rewards* are given on *Moral* Considerations, and not merely Physical.

3. *Rom.* 4. 13. *Paul* speaks of the *Inheritance: If they which be of the Law be Heirs, then Faith is made void*, &c.

4. *Rom.* 4. 16. *It is of Faith, that it might be by Grace, that the Promise might be sure to all the Seed*, &c. But doubtless this *Promise* is the *Promise of Salvation.*

5. So *Rom.* 5. 17, 18. [*Reigning in Life by Jesus Christ,*] is opposed to *Death reigning by* Adam: And lest there should be any room left to doubting, he expressly calleth

leth it, [*Justification of Life.*] And *ver.* 21. *Even so might Grace reign through Righteousness to eternal Life, through Jesus Christ our Lord.*

Object. *But* Vers. 9, 10. *the Apostle distinguisheth* Reconciliation *and* Salvation, *and maketh the* latter follow.

Answ. 1. But he saith not so *de statu salutis,* or of *right to Salvation,* but only of *actual Salvation* it self.

2. He still makes them both the fruits of the free Grace of Christ, and so excludes Works as much from Salvation as Justification: Nay he saith, [*Much more shall we be saved by his Life.*]

6. *Rom.* 6. 23. *The free Gift is* (not only *Righteousness*) *but eternal Life, through Jesus Christ our Lord.* And Life as free as Righteousness.

7. *Rom.* 8. 1, 2, 6. Freedom from the *Law of Death* as well as *sin,* is made equivalent to [*no Condemnation:*] And as Christ Jesus is the meritorious Cause, so that you may

may see that *only Faith* is not the *Condition*. *Vers.* 1. it's said, [*To be spiritually-minded is Life and Peace*:] Life as well as Righteousness. So *Vers.* 13, 14, 17.

8. *Hebr.* 11. throughout, speaks more expressly of *Salvation* by *Faith*, than *Justification*: And therefore the very Definition more respecteth *Salvation*, vers. 1. *Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.* And *verse* 13. which you take to contain a Definition of it, saith, *These all died in Faith, not having received the Promises, but*, &c. These *Promises, i. e.* the thing promised is certainly *more in Salvation* than *Justification* (which they then had.) I could name a multitude more plain Texts, but I willl add but two, wherein the Apostle of purpose extolleth Free-Grace, and excludeth Works, and expressly doth it as to our *Salvation*, equally as to our *Justification*.

9. The one is, *Tit.* 3. 4, 5, 6, 7. *But after the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared, not by Works of Righteousness which we have done, but according to*

his mercy he saved us, &c. *that being justified by his Grace, we should be made Heirs according to the hope of eternal Life.*

10. And *Ephes.* 2. 4,5,6,7,8,9. *But God who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in trespasses and sins, hath quickned us together with Christ: By Grace ye are saved. And hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus: that in the ages to come, he might shew the exceeding riches of his Grace in his kindness towards us through Christ Jesus. For by Grace ye are* saved *through Faith; and that not of your selves, it is the gift of God: Not of Works, lest any man should boast.*

Did ever the Apostle more fully and and expresly exclude Works from *Justification*, than here he doth from *saving us?* or make *Justification* of free Grace, more than here he doth *Salvation?* I shall therefore take leave still confidently to conclude, That *it is no more wrong to Christ and Free-Grace to say, That Obedience justifieth as a Condition; than to*

say,

say, It saveth as a Condition: And that as oft as Scripture makes it a *Condition of Salvation*, it certainly giveth us proof, that it is *a Condition of final Absolution or Justification:* And that it never was the mind of *Paul* or the Holy Ghost, to distinguish so far between the *way to Justification*, and the *right to Salvation*, as you do; or to make one more free than the other.

FINIS.

EXCEPTIONS

Againſt a

VVRITING

OF

Mr. *R. BAXTERS*,

In Anſwer to ſome

ANIMADVERSIONS

Upon his

APHORISMS.

By Mr. *Chr. Cartwright* of *York*.

LONDON,

Printed for *Nevil Simmons* and *Jonath. Robinſon*, at the Princes-Arms and Golden-Lion, in St. *Pauls* Church-yard, 1675.

ANIMADVERSIONS
APHORISMS.

Exceptions againſt a Writing of Mr. R. Baxters, *in Anſwer to ſome Animadverſions upon his Aphoriſms.*

HOw Relations ſhould be *inter Entia & Nihil* I cannot ſee; For *Nihil* is *Non ens*; & *inter ens & non ens non datur medium.* Page 2. l. 2.

Εὐδοκία is indeed for moſt part ſo taken, as to include Love and Good-will; yet it ſeems to be otherwiſe taken *Matth.* 11. 26. and *Luke* 10. 21. as *Dr. Twiſſe* obſerveth. And it is true, Εὐδοκία & *Beneplacitum* expreſs one the other: yet if we conſider the propriety of the words, both of them may well ſignifie the Will and Pleaſure of God concerning any thing whatſoever. It is obſerved, that the Lxx Interpreters deviſed the word Εὐδοκέω to expreſs the Hebrew *Ratſa*, which is as much as *Velle*; though it be often uſed for *Benevolum eſſe*. The Members of that diſtinction, [*Gratia gratum faciens, & Gratia gratis data*] fall one into another, as well as the Members of this, [*Voluntas Beneplaciti, & Voluntas Signi*] yet the diſtinction, though not ſo exact, may be uſeful. l. 4. *Vindic. Lib.* 1. *Part.* 2. *Sect.* 20.

1. What you intended, I know not; but you ſeem to ſpeak alike of all the Signs mentioned, *Aphor.* p. 3. *Ibid.* 2. I find *Aquinas* expreſs for this, that *Voluntas Signi*, is but *Signum Voluntatis*; ſo that according to him *Voluntas Beneplaciti* ſeems indeed to ſignifie the whole Will of God, properly ſo called; and *Voluntas Signi* the whole Will of God alſo, ſo far forth as there is any ſignification of it. But however, I ſee not how you can hence infer, [then *impletio voluntatis beneplaciti de eventu, non eſt ſignum voluntatis beneplaciti de jure*]. This ſeems but a meer evaſion; it ſufficeth, that *Imple-* *Ibid.* 3. *Part* 1. *Quæſt.* 19. *Art.* 11.

sio is *Signum Voluntatis de eventu*, as *Præceptum* is *Signum Voluntatis de Officio*.

Ibid. 1. When you say, that God doth permit, and more than permit the Wicked to amend; I suppose you mean, he doth command them: But is not this to take the word [permit] morally? Yet *pag.* 5. you say, That you speak all the while of Permission Natural, not of Moral Permission. 2. Permission is only made *Signum Voluntatis Dei de malo*. Thus *Aquinas*, *Permissio ad malum refertur, operatio autem ad bonum.* And *Maccovius*, *Objectum Voluntatis Permissivæ Dei est peccatum. Ita quidem est. Nam bonum, quod vult, vult Voluntate effectivâ, non permissivâ.* 3. That *Permissio Mali*, is *certum signum voluntatis Dei de malo quoad eventum*, I think is not to be denied. [*The Permissive Decree* (saith Bp *Davenant*) *concerning Sinful Actions, implyeth an infallibility of the Events so permitted*]. And he cites *Ruiz*, saying, *Positâ permissione, certissima est futuritio peccati, quod permittitur & omnium circumstantiarum, quæ permittuntur in illo.* So Dr. *Twisse*, *Posito decreto permittendi peccatum, non potuit homo à peccato abstinere: hæc tamen necessitas ex hypothesi cum libertate convenit.* *Camero* makes this the reason, why God doth foreknow evil, because he doth decree to permit it; which were no reason, if the Event did not certainly follow Permission. *Stat igitur sententia mea, Deus novit peccatum fore, quia decrevit permittere peccatum.* And he speaks divers times to this purpose. So *Maccovius*, *Deus præscit futura peccata. Ergo decrevit permittere. Nam quæ Deus præscit fore, ea præscit fore ex eo, quia decrevit.* The same Author also gives another reason; *Permissionem necessariò sequitur eventus: hoc est, quod permittit Deus, necessariò evenit.---Ratio etiam hoc ipsum evincit. Nam si Permissio nihil aliud est, quam gratiæ Dei substractio, sive privatio, quâ posita peccatum impediretur, ut à nobis antè ostensum est, fieri non potest, ut Creatura non labatur ubi Deus eam non sustentat: in Deo enim Movemur, vivimus, & sumus.* And again; *Non agitur de Permissione Ethicâ, quæ nihil aliud est quàm Concessio, sed de Physicâ, hoc est, de τῷ non-impedire. Quid verò sit disquiritur; Nos cum* Whitakero *dicimus, quod sit privatio auxilii divini, quo posito peccatum impediretur.*

Part 1. *Quæst.* 19. *Art.* 12.

Thes. Theolog. Disput. 26.

Animad. p. 162.

Vindic. Lib. 1. *Part* 1. §. 3. §. 4.

Adversf. Tilen. pag. 193.

De Providen. Disp. 5. *Thes. Theolog.* part 1 *Disp.* 26.

Part 2. *Disp.* 14.

dretur.----Necessariò ergò sequitur Permissionem Lapsus: interim tamen Permissio non est causa Lapsus, sed antecedens solùm. 4. *Austins* saying, which I cited, seems to hold out thus much, That as well God's *Permittere* as his *Facere*, is a sure sign of his Will concerning the Event. 5. I see not, that the Opinion of the necessity of Physical Efficient Predetermination doth deny God's Permission, seeing that Predetermination is *de Bono*, or *de Actione quà tali*; but Permission is *de Malo*, or *de obliquitate Actionis*. Dr. *Twisse* in that very Digression which you mention, after a tedious Dispute against that Proposition, grants as much as (I think) *Perkins* did, or any need desire. For he grants, *Manifestò sequi peccati existentiam ex permissione ejus Divinâ*: He adds indeed, *Nequaquam sequitur ex naturâ Permissionis in genere, quod non paucis Theologis visum est, ut in superioribus accepimus, sed ex peculiari modo permissionis divinæ, constante sc. negatione gratiæ, quippe sine quâ peccatum à nemine vitari potest.* But this is that Permission which Divines speak of, as I have shewed. What he further adds, *de peccato definitè sumpto*, viz. that a bare Permission doth not infer the existence of it, seems little to the purpose. To his Instance about Formation, I Answer: There is a Restraining Grace as well as a Renewing; God vouchsafes the one to many, to whom he doth not vouchsafe the other; see *Gen.* 20. 6. I grant, that besides a meer Permission, there must be (as he speaks) *aliqua alia rerum administratio, secundum quam actus aliquis naturalis patretur, quæ sit proxima materia talis deformitatis*: and that *quoties juxta Permissionem Divinam res aliqua sortitur effectum, toties Dei permissio non est solitaria, sed aliam Divinam Providentiæ gubernationem concomitantem obtinet.* But I suppose, that *Perkins* and others comprehend all under the name of Permission, that being it upon which Sin indefinitely considered, as *Twisse* himself confesseth, doth follow, though for the specification of the sin something more be required. The reason is, because *malum* is *privatio*, and so *in alieno fundo habitat*; therefore there cannot be *Permissio Mali*, but there must also be *Effectivus Concursus ad id, in quo Malum existit.* But for the thing it self *Twisse* is as clear (I think) as any. *Nec* (*inquit*) *minùs efficax esse*

Vindic. Lib. 2. *Digr.* 3. §. 3.

Vind. lib. 2 §. 2. §. 1.

esse dicimus decretum Dei de Permissione Mali, quam de Effectione Boni.

5. 1. I make *Voluntas Signi*, as put for *Signum Voluntatis*, to be but metaphorically *Voluntas*; yet I hold that there is *Voluntas propriè dicta, quæ Signo indicatur.* 2. When I say [so far forth as the *Signum* is *præceptum*] it is only (as you might see) to shew, that *Voluntas Signi* (not *Signum Voluntatis*, but *voluntas cujus signum est Præceptum*) is the same with that which you call [Will of Precept]. 3. If *Dr. Twisse* do not extend it to the whole Law, but only to Precept, it may be he had not occasion to extend it further. Neither do you speak so fully in your *Aphorisms* as in this Writing. You mention indeed Legislative Will, but so as to call it also *Præceptive*, and to make the Object of it our Duty, *Aphor. pag.* 4. 4. That he doth take notice of the Immanent Will *de debito*, whereof *Præceptum* is *Signum*, is clear by the words which I cited, *viz. Precepta non indicant quid Deus velit esse Nostri Officii*, &c. Yea your self here say, *p.* 4. That he makes *Præcipere & Vetare* to be the Objects of God's Will; and that this clearly implies, that he took in the Immanent Acts, of which they were the Objects. You add indeed, That he so often contradicteth it by speaking otherwise, that you doubt it fell from him *ex improviso*: but I see no cause for any such surmise.

6. 1. Those words of yours [*to bestow good upon a Man*]
3. 9. I know not how I omitted; perhaps because I thought there was no need of expressing them. For however they must be understood; because God's Word and Truth is else ingaged in a Threatning as well as in a Promise. 2. You say, *Append.* p. 48. *That the absolute promise of a New Heart is made to wicked Men:* where you seem to speak of a Promise properly taken, as distinct from Prophesie or Prediction: Yet *Aphor. p.* 9. you say, That *Absolute Promises are but meer Predictions*; so that you seem not well reconciled to your self. But you best know your own meaning, only I think it meet that you express it so, as that none may have occasion to stumble at it.

Ibid. I see indeed, that you call it *Legislative Will:* But,
4. *Ibid.* 1. you make Legislative and Preceptive both one, and make the Object of it Man's Duty, *Aphor. p.* 4. So that

you

you rather seem to restrain the word [Legislative] by the word [Preceptive], than to enlarge the word [Preceptive] by the word [Legislative]. 2. When you take the word [Legislative] largely, you make Precept and Promise distinct parts of it: So that still it is strange to me that you should say; *That Promises fall under the Will of Purpose, not of Precept.* For if the Will of Precept be taken strictly and properly, it is superfluous to say, That Promises do not fall under the Will of Precept: Neither on the other side is it true, if the Will of Precept be taken largely and improperly, *viz.* for the whole Legislative Will, which doth contain both Precept and Promise.

These two Questions (as you now make them) you comprise in one *Aphorism*, p. 15. and equally determine of both. For you say, *That the Life promised in the First Covenant, was in the judgment of most Divines* (to whom you incline) *only the continuance of that Estate that* Adam *was in in Paradise:* So that according to this Opinion, *Adam* was both to have continued in the same place, and also in the same Estate. I think still, he should have been changed in respect of both. *In* Adamo (*inquit* Barlous) *omnes in universum homines jus ad Cœlum habebant, & seipse stetisset, ipsum Cœlum unusquisque habuisset; adeò ut jus ad Cœlum in* Adamo *habuimus primævum, à Christo jus rest tutum.* *Adam*'s continuance in the same Estate, is most clearly expressed by those whom you seem to follow; and how then can you say, That you did not meddle with that Question? And if he were to continue in the same Estate, no question he was also to continue in the same Place; For Heaven is no place for such an Estate as *Adam* had in Paradise. *Ibid.* *Ibid.* 15. *Exercit.* 2.

I shall wonder if any will be so bold as to affirm, That *Adam* was Created *in Patriâ*, and not *in Viâ*. How was he to be tryed by his Obedience, if he were not *Viator*, but *Comprehensor?* It seems also strange that any doubt should be made, whether *Adam* being Created after the Image and Likeness of God, were capable of Heavenly Blessedness. 7.

The Reasons which I alleadged, notwithstanding any thing you say against them, seem cogent. 1. By the Second Death, you might see, I meant not the same de- *Ibid.*

gree, yet the same kind of punishment. The Scripture seems to speak of several degrees of Hell-Torment, yet all is called the *Second Death*. And this Second Death, *viz.* Hell-Torment, *Adam* by his sin became liable unto: therefore if he had not sinned, he should have enjoyed a Life directly opposite to that Death, *viz.* Cœlestial Glory. The perpetual Death which *Adam* (without a Saviour) should have suffered, was not a perpetual abiding in the Estate of Death, *viz.* a perpetual separation of Soul and Body, or a meer privation of that Life he had before his Fall, but an enduring of eternal Torment; and so consequently the Life promised upon condition of Obedience, was not a perpetuating of his earthly Life, but the fruition of Heavenly Happiness. 2. I grant, God was able to change *Adam*'s State, not changing his Place; but it seems rather, that both should have been changed. And though we know not the Nature of the Life to come, yet we know it is not such a Life as *Adam* had in Paradise, to Eat, Drink, Marry, *&c.* 3. It is not in vain to say, How in an ordinary way of Providence should there have been room for Men upon Earth, if *Adam* and his Posterity, still increasing and multiplying *in infinitum*, should there have continued for ever? Your Friend and mine Mr. *Blake*, having urged this Argument, seems to enervate it when he hath done, saying, [*But a thousand of these God can expedite, when we are at a stand*]. But yet that without a Miracle it could be done, he doth not say, and he there professedly opposeth you in this Point. Whereas you add, [*Especially seeing God knew there would be no place for such difficulties*] I know not to what purpose it is. For the Opinion, which I impugn, doth suppose that upon which such difficulties do arise. 4. How should Paradise be a Type of Heaven, if Man should never have come to Heaven? If Heaven had not belonged unto him upon condition of his Obedience? Whereas you say, That *you little know where or what that Paradise was*; I do not well know what you mean. By [that Paradise] I suppose you understand (as I and others do) the Garden wherein *Adam* was placed: a place upon Earth for certain it was, and very pleasant; yet such a place as wherein *Adam* lived a natural Life, far beneath that happiness which he was made capable of.

Of the Coven. *chap.* 5.

Those

Those words [*Thou shalt die*] being not only meant of a privation of the Life which he then enjoyed, but also of eternal torment; it follows, That the Life implicitly promised, is to be understood, not only of the continuance of that Life, but of Eternal Blessedness. *Ibid.* 5. *Ibid.*

I do not say that any now are altogether as *Adam* was under the Covenant of Works; but that some are so under that Covenant, that *in statu quo* they have no part in the other Covenant, nor are guilty of contemning it, being utterly ignorant of it. *Ibid.*

To whom God doth not say, [*Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved*] to them in effect he doth say [*Obey perfectly and live*]; or, [*If thou sin, thou shalt die eternally*]. But there are many in the World to whom God doth not say [*Believe*, &c.] that Promise is altogether unknown unto them, they live and die without ever hearing of it, so that to them it is as if it had never been. Consider (I pray) what the Apostle saith to this purpose, *Ephes.* 2. 12. Might not the *Ephesians* have continued in that condition unto death? Do not many continue in the same Condition? I yeeld, that none are so under the Covenant of Works, but that if they repent and believe they shall have Mercy, and that by vertue of the New Covenant: but that which I stand upon is this, That the Covenant of Grace wherein Mercy is promised, being not revealed unto some, nor any way dispensed unto them, they cannot be said to be under it, nor shall be judged as transgressors of it. *Ibid.*

Add, 1. Though the Covenant of Grace had never been, yet I see not but such Mercies as the *Indians* enjoy, (setting aside the possibility of partaking of the New Covenant) might have been enjoyed. Add, 2. Though the Covenant of Works vouchsafeth no pardon of sin upon Repentance, yet surely it requiring perfect Obedience, consequently it also requireth Repentance and turning unto God. Else if the Covenant of Grace had not been made, Man after his Fall, though plunging himself into sin continually more and more, yet had contracted no more Guilt, nor incurred any greater Condemnation, than he did by his first Transgression. Add, 3. Christ as Mediator shall judge even those that never heard of any Salvation to be obtained by him; and consequently he will not judge them as guilty of neglecting that Salvation. 8.

Christ

Christ judgeth wicked Men as Rebellious Subjects; but as rebelling (I conceive) only against the Law, not against the Gospel, they being such as never were acquainted with it. Add, 4. There are common Mercies, (which might have been though the New-Covenant had not been) the abuse whereof is sufficient to condemn; yet the improvement of them is not sufficient to save. If such Mercies as meer *Pagans* enjoy tend to their recovery, How then are such said to be ἐλπὶδα μὴ ἔχοντες? *Ephes.* 2. 12.

Ibid. *Rom.* 2. 12. I cited to this purpose, to shew, That as they that sinned without the Law, shall perish without the Law; even so they that sinned without the Gospel, shall perish without the Gospel. That 2 *Thess.* 1. 7, 8. speaks not only of them that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, but also of such as know not God. The Apostle there seemeth to divide all the Wicked into two sorts, *viz.* such as know not God; so he describes the Gentiles, 1 *Thess.* 4. 5. and such as obey not the Gospel, *&c.* that is, such as having had the Gospel preached unto them, would not receive it, either not at all, or not sincerely. Yet Christ (he saith) will in flaming fire take vengeance on both, as well on the former as on the latter. And here also I have Mr. *Blake* agreeing with me, and so, as that he citeth this very place to the same purpose as I do. *Infidels* (saith he) *that were never under any other Covenant than that of works, and Covenant-breaking Christians, are in the same condemnation; there are not two Hells, but one and the same for those that know not God, and those that obey not the Gospel of Christ,* 2 Thess. 1. 8.]

Of the Coven. *Chap.* 5. *p.* 23.

Ibid. You pass by that which I alledged from *Rom.* 6. *ult.* viz. That death, which is the wages of sin, is opposed to Eternal Life, which is the happiness of the Saints in Heaven. *Ergo*, Death comprehends in it the misery of the Damned in Hell; and that (you know) is it which the Scripture calls the *Second Death.* I marvel therefore that you make no more of it than to say, [*Call it the first or second Death, as you please*]?

Ibid. The Argument drawn from the Bodies Co-partnership with the Soul, I take to be a good proof of its Resurrection. *Tertullian* surely thought so, or else he would not so frequently have used this Argument. *Age* (*inquit*) *scindant adversarii nostri carnis animaeque contextum*

De Resur. cap. 15.

textum prius in vitæ administratione, ut ita audeant scindere illud etiam in vitæ remuneratione. Negent operum societatem, ut meritò possint etiam mercedem negare. Non sit particeps in sententia caro, si non fuerit in causâ. And again, *Secundum consortia laborum consortia etiam decurrant necesse est præmiorum.* And again also, *Non possunt separari in mercede (caro & anima) quas opera conjungit.* And surely that of the Apostle, 2 *Cor.* 5. 10. [*That every Man may receive the things done in the Body*] doth imply, That as the things were done in the Body, so also the Reward must be received in the Body. As for the dissolution of the Body which you speak of, it is but such a punishment as the Godly lie under as well as the Wicked, until the Resurrection. Therefore it is not probable, that it was the only punishment intended to the Body in the First Covenant. What-ever some new Philosophers may say, true Philosophy (I think) doth tell us, That it is the Body, which by the Sensitive Soul doth feel pain; even as it is the Eye, which doth see by the Visive Faculty. *Ibid.* c. 38. *Ibid.* c. 8.

You observe not (it seems) that I did but answer your *Queries*, which you made *Append.* p. 10. To the second, [*When should he have risen?*] I thought, and still think it sufficient to answer, That *Adam*, and so others, should either have risen in the end of the World, as now they shall, or when God should please to raise them. It is for you to prove that it could be neither the one way nor the other. *Ibid.*

How doth the Apostle 1 *Cor.* 15. seem to extend the Resurrection, which he speaks of, unto all, when he expressly limits it to those that are Christs? *vers.* 23. And when the whole discourse is about Resurrection unto Glory? *Expressè resurrectio Christi est causa resurrectionis eorum, qui ad Vitam Æternam suscitabuntur,* 1 Cor. 15. 20, 21, 22. To the same purpose also is that 1 *Thess.* 4. 14, *&c.* What the other Texts you speak of be, when you shew, I may consider then. This I grant, That the Wicked shall rise by the Power of Christ as Mediator, *John* 5. 28, 29. But that is not enough to prove, That had not Christ been Mediator, there should have been no Resurrection; no more than it follows, that otherwise none should have been condemned for sin, because now all 9. Maccov. *de statu primi ho.* Disp. 5.

all Judgment is committed unto Christ, *John* 5. 22, 27.

Ibid. 7. 24. I see no such difference betwixt them. For slaying before the foundation of the World, cannot be meant of actual slaying, but only of fore-ordaining to be slain.

Ibid. I mean Christ's Sufferings, as in obedience to his Father he submitted unto them. *This Commandment have I received of my Father*, said he, *John* 10. 18. Sufferings simply considered without Obedience, find no acceptance with God. No need therefore to except against the Phrase commonly used, [*Passive Obedience*] *i. e.* Obedience in Suffering. Christ had a Commandment to lay down his Life, it was the Will of his Father that he should do it, and in obedience thereto he did it.

Vide Gataker *cont.* Gomarum *p.* 14, 15. *Ibid.* *Ibid.* 56. The Rule (*A quatenus ad omne*, &c.) doth not here make for you, because it was not Christ's suffering meerly as obedience, but as such obedience, *viz.* Obedience in suffering, that was satisfactory. So that neither Suffering without Obedience, nor Obedience without Suffering would avail. *Sed quæ non prosunt singula, juncta juvant.*

Ibid. If only such Obedience be meant *Rom.* 5. 19. as is opposed to *Adam*'s disobedience, and therefore Active Obedience is meant, it will follow that only Active Obedience is meant, which you will not admit, because *Adam*'s Disobedience was only Active. But Christ's Obedience in Suffering, may be opposed to *Adam*'s Disobedience in Acting; and Christ's Passive Obedience (suffer me to speak so) may stand in opposition to Disobedience in general, as working a contrary effect, *viz.* Whereas Disobedience doth make Sinful, Christ's (Passive) Obedience doth make Righteous; and in that respect only doth the Apostle oppose Christ's Obedience to *Adam*'s Disobedience.

10. *Ibid.* 58. 1. The Apostle saying, That *Christ was made under the Law*, it seems to be without doubt, That it was the Will of God that he should observe the Law. For is it not the Will of God that his Law should be observed by such as are under it? Yet Christ might observe the Law for some ends peculiar to himself, as for those ends he was made under it. Christ according to the flesh was a Jew, therefore meet it was he should observe the Jewish Law, otherwise he had been an offence unto them.

2. As

2. As Christ was not made Man for himself, so (it is true) he was not bound to observe the Law for himself. But thus you should not limit it to some Works; for all his Works were so for us, as he was *nobis natus, nobis datus*, Isa. 9. 6. Yet being made Man, as Man he was bound (I think) to perform that Obedience which God did require of Man. You say, That he used the Legal Ceremonies to shew his subjection: So say I; and this (I think) is against you, it being meant of such subjection as the Law required of all those that were under it. 3. If Christ were *sub Lege*, as the Apostle saith he was, then it was *ex Lege* that he observed those legal rites. Yet, I grant, it was *ex vi sponsionis propriæ*; so all that he did, so his very being made Man was. Whereas you say, [*Else the Law would have obliged him to the act and end together*]; I Answer, The Law doth oblige, according to the Will of the Law-giver, who might oblige Christ to it otherwise than he did others. I think the Ceremonial Observances, besides the Typical Nature of them, are to be considered as Religious Rites, whereby God was honoured and worshipped; and so Christ as Man was obliged unto them, Man being bound to honour and worship God, so as God doth require of him. That which you add of the burthen of Penal Actions, seems impertinent; For Penal Actions (I think) have the nature of Sufferings, and so they concern not the Point in Controversie betwixt us, which is only concerning Actions as Pious, not as Penal.

Your Reasons drawn from the Actions of Christ, receiving their chief Dignity from his chief Nature, *&c.* will reach further (I think) than you intend or desire, even to make all Christ's Active Righteousness to be satisfactory for us. And so indeed you seem to hold, *Aph.* p. 61. where you say, [*The Interest of the Divine Nature in all the Works of Christ, maketh them to be infinitely meritorious and satisfactory*]. Yet here, *p.* 10. you seem to restrain it to Penal Actions, and the burthen of tedious Ceremonious Worship, as you call it. For my part, I yet think, That as the Holiness of Christ's Nature, so also the Holiness of his Life was requisite to qualifie him for suffering, and (by suffering) satisfying for us. *Him that knew no sin, God made sin for us*, 2 Cor. 5. *ult.* *Such an High-Priest became us, who is holy,* *Ibid.* 11. 9. 59.

holy, harmleſs, &c. Heb. 7. 26. Mr. *Blake* (whoſe Judgment I do much value, though I cannot force mine own further than I am convinced) in this Point, concerning the Imputation of Chriſt's Active Righteouſneſs, ſeems to differ both from you and me; he ſaith, [*Chriſt had been innocent, though he had never come under the Law to have yeelded that obedience*]. But how Chriſt could have continued innocent, without yeelding obedience to the Law; or how being Man, he could be exempt from that Law, whereby the Creature is to ſhew his ſubjection to the Creator, I cannot ſee. He adds, [*His Perſon had not been as ours under the Law, unleſs of his own accord he had been made under the Law*]. He was not made Man (ſay I) but of his own accord; yet being Man, I conceive it was neceſſary that he ſhould be under that Law which God impoſed upon Man, and ſo both under the Moral Law, as the eternal Rule of Righteouſneſs; and alſo under the Ceremonial Law, as the preſcribed Rule of Worſhip. He adds further, [*Somewhat might be ſaid for the ſubjection of the Humane Nature in Chriſt, the Manhood of Chriſt, which was a Creature, but the Perſon of Chriſt, God-Man, ſeems to be above ſubjection*]. This I confeſs ſeems ſtrange to me; for the Humane Nature of Chriſt, though perſonally united to the Divine Nature, being ſtill a Creature, muſt needs be in ſubjection to him that made it; and therefore the Perſon of Chriſt, God-Man, though not as God, but as Man, muſt be under ſubjection. He goes on ſaying, [*We know the mortality of the Humane Nature, yet Chriſt had never died, unleſs he had made himſelf obedient unto death; neither needed to have ſerved, unleſs he had humbled himſelf*, Phil. 2. *to take upon him the form of a Servant*]. But Mortality is no neceſſary conſequent of Humane Nature, as ſubjection unto God is; and Chriſt taking upon him the Nature of Man, did *eo nomine* take upon him the form of a Servant; for Man muſt be Servant unto God, the Creature to the Creator. He bids, [See the *Aſſemblies Confeſſion of Faith*, Chap. 8. Sect. 5. and Dr. *Featlies* Speeches upon it]. Theſe Speeches I cannot now ſee, but I have ſeen them long ago, and was not ſatisfied with them. The words of the Aſſembly are ſuch, as that ſome queſtion may be made of the meaning of them, *viz.* Whether by [Chriſt's

Of the Coven. *c.* 12. *p.* 78.

Vide Gatakerum *noſtrum adverſus Lucium, Reſponſ. ad vindic.* Part. 2. Sect. 7. pag. 54. *&c Et contra* Gomarum *p.* 4. *&* 22.

[Christ's perfect Obedience and Sacrifice of himself] be not meant one and the same thing, so that the latter words are exegetical to the former. But to return to you, who say, [*The Question should be, Whether it be only* Pœna Christi, *or* Obedientia *also, that satisfieth and meriteth*]? I think it is not simply *Pœna*, or *Obedientia*, but *Pœna Obedientialis*, and *Obedientia Pœnalis*.

1. The Creator is absolute Lord over the Creature, and so you grant no Work of the Creature can be meritorious. 2. You seem to make even the Actions of sinful men capable of being meritorious, though less properly. 3. Though Obedience be absolutely perfect, yet if absolutely due, it seems repugnant to *Luke* 17. 10. that it should be meritorious. 11. *Ibid.* 60.

The interest of the Divine Nature doth certainly put an infinite excellency into all Christ's Actions: Yet I see not how Christ's good Actions (I speak of meer Actions, which have no penality or suffering mixed with them) could properly be meritorious, they being otherwise due, supposing Man had not sinned, and so there had needed no satisfaction to be made for him. Though I am not of their mind, who think that the Son of God should have been incarnate, though Man had never sinned; yet I see no reason to doubt but so it might have been: Now *hoc supposito*, all Christ's meer Active Righteousness would have been due, but not his Passive Righteousness. *Ibid.* *Ibid.* 61.

I have divers times told you, That when we speak of Christ's Sufferings as meritorious or satisfactory, we are not to consider them meerly as Penal, but as Obediential also; so that your long Section hath nothing against me. 12.

My interpretation of these words, [*The Father judgeth no Man*] containeth indeed no absolute exclusion of the Father, neither can I admit any such exclusion; but an exclusion of him in some respect it doth contain. He that doth a thing, yet not immediately by himself, but by another whom he hath put in authority to do it, may be said in some respect not to do it. When the Egyptians cried to *Pharaoh* for Bread, he bad them go to *Joseph*, &c. *Gen.* 41. 55. *q. d.* I meddle not with these things, *Joseph* is to do all such matters. Yet *Pharaoh* indeed did all, though not immediately, but by *Joseph*. Your Arguments, *p.* 13. press not me, who never intended to deny that it belongs to Christ's Mediatorship, *Ibid.* 10. 65.

ship, and namely to his Kingly Office, to judge the World; only I shewed what I took to be the meaning of those Texts, *John* 5. 22. & 27. Wherein I followed *Jansenius* and *Maldonate*, no absurd Expositors, though Papists. And even *Calvin* and *Beza* also seem to agree with me in the exclusion of the Father, *v.* 22. *In Patre nihil mutatum est*, &c. *Est enim ipse in Filio, & in eo operatur*, saith *Calvin*. And so *Beza*, *Negat Christus à Patre administrari hunc mundum, ita, viz. ut* Judæi *arbitrabantur; qui Patrem à Filio separabant, cum Pater contrà non nisi in personâ Filii manifestati in carne mundum regat.*

Calv. *in* John 5. 22. Beza *in eundem loc.*

14. *Ibid.* 67. You seem to make the present death of *Adam* a part of the rigorous execution of the Law, when you say, *Aphor.* p. 33. [*That the Sentence should have been immediately executed to the full, or that any such thing is concluded in the words of the Threat*, In the day that thou eatest, &c. *I do not think; for that would have prevented both the Being, the Sin, and the Suffering of his Posterity*]. How would this have been prevented, if *Adam*'s present Death were not included in the immediate and full execution of the Sentence, *i. e.* in the rigorous execution of it? Therefore though you argue, That the words of the Threat were not so meant, as that the Sentence should immediately be executed to the full, yet your very Argument supposeth, That if the Sentence should have been so executed, *Adam* should presently have died. Now though Christ had not died, yet this part of the rigorous execution of the Law might have been suspended, and supposing the propagation of Mankind must have been: against this (so far as I see) you say nothing.

Ibid. 11. 68. I desire to be as favourable an Animadverter as Truth will permit: but how under the name of Animadversion I defend what you say, I do not see. If you had used the word [*Chastisements*], it would not have freed you from mine Animadversion. For I shew that Chastisements are Punishments. And whereas you speak of my great oversight, it is indeed your great mistake; for I did not take those words to express your Opinion, only you seemed therein to allow the distinction betwixt Afflictions of Love and Punishments; this is it which I thought worthy of an Animadversion.

You

You might see, that I make the Afflictions of God's Children in their Nature to be Evil, and a Curse, though not so to them, they being sanctified and working for their good. And I presume, those Divines whom you oppose, meant as both you and I do, though you interpret them otherwise. The difference here betwixt you and me is this; You allow their Expression, and dislike their meaning; I allow their Meaning, and dislike their Expression. They distinguish betwixt Chastisements and Punishments, which distinction in your *Aphorisms* you seem to allow, only disliking the Application of it. The distinction it self I dislike, though I think that some who used it, did not err in that which they intended in it. In the Contents of *Isa.* 27. there are these words, [*God's Chastisements differ from Judgments*], which words I hold incongruous. I like not that of Mr. *Kendal* against Mr. *Goodwin*, Chap. 4. p. 139. [*Punishment aimeth chiefly at the satisfaction of Justice, Correction at the amendment of the Offender*]. That is not true of all Punishments, see *Geld.* Lib. 6. cap. 14. Yet the meaning of those that used them, was not (I think) erroneous. 15.

I would give you no cause to quarrel with me. But is not this your own Argument? Do you not thus oppose the *Common Judgment* as you call it? [*They are ascribed to God's anger*, &c.] *Aphor. p.* 70. Do you not there oppose God's Anger to his Love? Whereas Love and Hatred, not Love and Anger are truly opposite. God may be angry with us, and yet love us; yea therefore angry with us, because he loveth us. *Rev.* 3. 20. There is *Ira Paterna & Castigans*, as well as *Ira Hostilis & Exterminans*, Davenant *in Col.* 3. 6. Where those words of yours are, which you say I almost repeat, I do not know. I expressed mine own sence in mine own words; and my scope was only to correct that Opposition which you make betwixt Love and Anger, though I see that *Aphor.* p. 71. you speak of a mixture of Love and Anger, and say, *That there is no Hatred, though there be Anger.* My chief design in those Animadversions was, That in your Second Edition, which you promised, you might have occasion, if not to confirm your Assertions, yet to clear your Expressions. *Ibid.* 12. 70.

I know you oppose their sence that so distinguish, but their distinction simply considered you seem to admit; *Ibid.*

if you say that you do not, I am satisfied.

Ibid. *Ib. Ib.* Your words were of Affliction as Affliction, therefore of Affliction in general. You say, *Aphor.* p. 70. [*The very nature of Affliction is to be a loving punishment*, &c.] But you confess now, that you should have said [*Chastisement*]; and so I have my desire in this Particular, *viz.* your better expression.

Ibid. *Ib. Ib.* God is not the Father of the Unregenerate, though Elect, in respect of Actual Adoption: But you know that *Ephes.* 1. 5. [*Having predestinated us to the Adoption of Sons*, &c.] God having loved such with an everlasting Love, *viz. Benevolentia*, though not *Complacentia*, no marvel if he afflict them in Love before their Conversion, *viz.* in order to their Conversion. But (you know) I speak of Reprobates, and that it is written, [Jacob *Rom.* 9. 13. *have I loved, but* Esau *have I hated*]; Whether that import the Election of *Jacob*, and the Reprobation of *Esau*, I now dispute not; but I think it doth import God's love of the *Elect*, and his hatred of the Reprobate. *Deus omnes homines diligit* (*inquit* Aquinas) *&* Part 1. Quest. 23. Art. 3. ad 1. *etiam omnes Creaturas, in quantum omnibus vult aliquod bonum: non tamen quodcunque bonum vult omnibus. In quantum igitur non vult hoc bonum quod est vita æterna, dicitur eos odio habere, & reprobare.*

Ibid. *Ib. Ib.* Sanctified Suffering I hold to be *malum in se & suâ naturâ*; and so I think do they, against whom you dispute in your *Aphorisms*: but though Suffering be evil, yet as Sanctified it is not evil. *It is good for me that I was afflicted*, Psal. 119. 71.

16. Afflictions were then indeed to be loved, if they were good of their own Nature: but being only good as sanctified, we are not simply to desire them, but a sanctified use of them, and in that respect to rejoice in them, *Jam.* 1. 2, 3. *Rom.* 5. 3, 4, 5. Whereas you advise me to take heed of arguing thus, [*That which worketh for our good*, &c.] Where do I argue so? Rather thus; That which is sanctified to us, doth work for our good: and so though it be evil in it self, yet it is good to us. But Affliction is sanctified, *&c.*

Ibid. *Ib. Ib.* I am apt to oversee: but neither I, nor they (I think) whom you first opposed, deny Sin to be the meritorious cause of Affliction, if that were all you aimed at in your Question.

What

What I mean by Conformity unto Christ, you might see by *Rom.* 8. 17. which I cited: I may also add 1 *Pet.* 4. 17. In these places the Scripture speaks of suffering for well-doing, which is acceptable with God, 1 *Pet.* 2. 19. Yet I grant, sin is the Root of all suffering; so it was of Christ's suffering, though not his sin, but ours. Only I thought it meet to put you in mind, that God in sending Affliction hath other ends than to punish sin, which the places alledged do shew, and so other places. *Ibid.*

The Object of Love is not only present Good. There is a Love of Desire, as well as of Delight. The Spouse wanting Christ, was sick of Love, *Cant.* 5. 8. *Ibid.* 13. 71.

I did not say, That Sanctified Suffering is not Evil, but that it is not evil as sanctified. Suffering, though sanctified, is suffering still, and so evil; but as sanctified, it is good, and not evil. *Ibid.*

Those Arguments prove nothing against me, nor (I am perswaded) against those Divines mentioned in your *Aphorisms.* It is granted, That Death in it self is Evil, an Enemy, a Punishment, to be feared, avoided, &c. Yet as it is sanctified, it is good, a Friend, a Mercy, to be desired, embraced, &c. 2 *Cor.* 5. 6, 7, 8. *Phil.* 1. 21, 23. 17. *Ib. Ibid.*

It is evil, 1. to them to whom it is not managed for their good. 2. To them also to whom it is so managed, but not as it is so managed. *Ibid.* *Ib.* 72.

Lex abrogata vim nullam habet obligandi, saith *Grotius.* Well, but we are not always so much to mind the strict propriety of words, as what they that use them do mean by them. *Ibid.* 14. 79. *De Satisfact.* p. 57.

That which you speak of our discharge before believing, might have been omitted, the question being about Believers, and so believing presupposed. *Ibid.*

Why the Justification and Condemnation of Believers doth not depend upon the Law, this (I think) is a sufficient reason, *Christ hath redeemed them from the Curse of the Law,* &c. *Gal.* 3. 13. *Si quid novisti rectius isto, Candidus imperti.* 18. 15. 83.

The Law so concurs to the constitution of Guilt, as were there no Law, there were no Transgression. In the other, two Particulars, which follow, we do accord also. *Ibid.* *Ib. Ib.*

Ibid. 16. 85. 1. Neither did I mean so, as if there were no explicit threatning to Unbelievers, but only this, That pardon of all sin being promised upon condition of believing, it implies that death is only threatned in case of unbelief. And tho there be an express threatning to Unbelievers, (*viz. Mark* 16. 16.) yet not only to Unbelievers. The threatning of death only to Unbelievers, is (I think) only implyed in the promise of Life made to Believers. 2. Neither did my words hold out any other meaning of 2 *Thess.* 1. 7, 8. than what you express. 3. The new Law or Gospel requiring Faith, the Fruit whereof is Obedience; it will condemn the disobedient, *i. e.* it will leave them to the condemnation of the Law, while they remain in that estate, though it hold out Mercy upon condition, that they believe and bring forth Fruit meet for repentance.

Ibid. 17. 86. Mr. *Lawson* I know for an able Scholar; but his reasons for that Position I do not know. If no Law, no sin; for *sin is a transgression of the Law*, 1 John 3. 4.

19. *Ib.* 89. Your saying, *Aphor.* p. 89. [*Whosoever will believe to the end, shall be justified*], may seem to imply, That though a Man believe, yet he remains unjustified, (as well as unglorified) until he go on and hold out unto the end: otherwise (I suppose) all will yeeld, That a Man must believe unto the end, that he may be justified unto the end.

Ibid. 18. *Ib.* 1. Though you deny that which I say your words seem to imply; yet what your meaning was, or is, you do not clearly shew. 2. You seemed to make the Life promised to *Adam*, only a continuance of his present enjoyments, which were as all upon the Earth, so many of them earthly, and none comparable to the happiness of the Saints in Heaven.

Ibid. *Ib. Ib.* 1. Though there be several degrees of Damnation, yet all being the damnation of Hell, I do not think that there is such difference between one degree of Damnation and another, as there is betwixt the scratch of a Pin, and the pulling off a Man's flesh with Pincers. 2. If *Adam* had not sinned, he should have had that happiness which all those Priviledges that you mention tend unto; and by his sin he forfeited all that happiness. Besides, when I spake of the identity of Punishment for kind, though not for degree, I meant it of *Pœna sensus*; and that

that (I conceived) was your meaning also.

No question but the Confirmation, Radication, and further degree of Grace is comprehended in those Promises, [*I will put my Law in their inward parts*, &c.] as a further degree of Spiritual Circumcision is promised, *Deut.* 30. 6. and a greater measure of the Spirit, *Luk.* 11. 13. But though the Circumstances of those Texts do so limit the Promises contained in them, (which yet may be questioned concerning *Deut.* 30. 6.) yet so do not (that I see) the Circumstances of that in *Jer.* 31. 33. and *Heb.* 8. 10. And therefore there is no reason to restrain these in that manner. *Ampliandi favoret.* Besides, it is certain, Man can perform no condition required of him, except God work it in him, 2 *Cor.* 3. 5. *Phil.* 2. 13. *Ibid.*

By Relative Change you mean Justification and Adoption: Now I think it is no hard matter to prove a real change in any, in whom this relative change is, *i. e.* That they that are justified and adopted, are also sanctified. 1. They that are justified and adopted, are Christs, *Gal.* 3. ult. *Ergo*, they that are justified and adopted, are sanctified. For so are they that are Christs, *Rom.* 8. 9. Take the Syllogism, if you please, thus; They that are * Christs, are sanctified: But they that are justified and adopted, are Christs. Therefore they that are justified and adopted, are sanctified. 2. They that are in a state of Salvation, are sanctified, 2 *Thess.* 2. 13. *John* 3. 3, 5. But they that are justified and adopted, are in a state of Salvation, *Tit.* 3. 7. *Rom.* 8. 17. *Ergo*. Hear one, with whom you are acquainted, and whom I shall have occasion to cite afterward, *viz.* Wotton, *Ut regni* (*inquit*) *cœlestis hereditatem adspiscamur, & venia peccatorum, & sanctimonia opus est, — Quâ enim ratione heres esse vitæ æternæ intelligatur, qui immundus est?* And lest you should put this off, and say, That Sanctification indeed is requisite before any can enter into the possession of Eternal Life, but not before they can have a right unto it; he adds, *Remissione igitur sive condonatione opus est ad hereditatis jus obtinendum: Sed nequaquam in illâ sunt omnia. Etenim* (*ut paulò antè significavi*) *accedat etiam oportet regeneratio, per quam sanctimoniâ imbuamur. Quare Christus factus est nobis & justitia, & sanctificatio*, 1 Cor. 1. 30. For the Arguments which you mention in Mr. *Bedford*'s Book, if you had propoun-

Ib. 91.

Ibid. 19. 95.

* *Viz.* By actual relation unto him.

De Reconcil. Part 2. Lib. 2. Cap. 22.

ded any of them, I should have considered how to answer them. Now as you only refer me to that Book for Arguments against my Opinion, so shall I refer you to another Book for answer to those Arguments, *viz.* Mr. *Gataker*'s lately published.

20. Nay indeed, if Baptism be a Seal of remission of sins, then remission of sins (I think) is not the end of Baptism. For the thing must be, before it be sealed, *i. e.* confirmed. Though Baptism therefore be ordained to this end, to seal remission of sins, yet none can make this use of it, until they believe, and so have their sins remitted. Neither doth this make for *Anabaptists*, for Circumcision was of the same nature, *Rom.* 4. 11. Yet were Infants circumcised. [*Not all that are baptized* (saith Bp. *Downam*) *are truly justified*]. And again, [*It is not necessary, that every one baptized, should presently be regenerated, or justified: but Baptism is a Seal to him of the Righteousness of Faith, either to be applied by the Holy Ghost to the Elect dying in infancy, or to be apprehended also by Faith in them, who living to years of discretion, have grace to believe*]. Again also, [*The* Papists *themselves teach, That the Sacraments do not confer Grace* ponenti obicem mortalis peccati; *but all that come to Baptism, are guilty* (*if not justified before*) *of mortal sin, not only* adulti, *who to their original sin have added their own personal transgression, but Infants also, who besides their original corruption, in respect whereof they are mortally dead in sin, stand guilty of* Adam's *most heinous transgression*]. 2. Baptism is as well a Seal of Sanctification, as of Remission of Sins; for it seals the whole Covenant, and all the Promises contained in it. And as Circumcision signified and sealed the taking away of the Foreskin (or superfluity of naughtiness, as St. *James* speaketh, *Chap.* 1. 21.) of the Heart, so doth Baptism signifie & seal the washing away of the filthiness, as well as of the guiltiness of it. Indeed Mr. *Mede* in one of his *Diatribæ*, would have the thing signified in Baptism, to be only the sanctifying Grace of the Holy Ghost; wherein I cannot subscribe unto him. Whereas you speak of an External Covenant, as some call it; some may express themselves one way, some another, yet all mean the same thing. For my part, I do not use to speak of an External Covenant, but of an

Of Perseverance. *ch.* 12.

Exter-

External Being in the Covenant, which is all that ordinarily we can be assured of in respect of others, and which is enough for admittance to the Sign and Seal of the Covenant. The People of the Jews, until by professed unbelief they fell away, were generally in the Covenant, *Rom.* 9. 4. even in that Covenant, which they that were Aliens from, had no hope, *Ephes.* 2. 12. Yet many of them were but externally in the Covenant, *Rom.* 9. 6, 27, 29. You labour in vain, when you seek to evade that Text, *Rom.* 8. 9. How should any be actually Christs, except they be united to him? And how united, but by the Spirit? 1 *Cor.* 6. 17. And if you meant (as you say) only of Saving Relations, Can a Saving Relation be put upon any, and yet no Saving Work wrought in them? Neither truly is a meer profession such a real change, as I supposed you did mean, *viz.* a change of the Heart, whereby one is made a new Creature.

I think that properly there are not distinct Laws, from whose distinct condemnations we must be freed: That the Gospel doth not condemn any, but only leave some to the Law to be condemned by it, though their Condemnation by reason of the Gospel, as of every Mercy neglected, or abused, will be the greater. 23. *Ibid.* 103. *Ad.* 1.

The Father (as I have said before) doth judg, though by Christ, see *Acts* 17. 31. And however, I see not how you can conclude any thing to the purpose by this Argument. *Ibid.* *Ad.* 2.

If for every several Accusation there must be a several Righteousness, then there will be need of infinite Righteousnesses, seeing there may be infinite accusations. But one Righteousness, *viz.* that of Christ's Satisfaction for us, will take off all Accusations brought against us; else how doth the Apostle say, *Who shall lay any thing to the charge*, &c. *Rom.* 8. 33, 34. Indeed the Promise is made upon condition of believing, and therefore the not performing of the Condition, debars from benefit of the Promise. But this (I conceive) is not properly a new Accusation, but only a making good of the former accusation, we having nothing to shew why it should not stand in force against us. Your self did well distinguish *p.* 22. betwixt a Condition as a Condition, and a Condition as a Duty. Now Faith as a Condition, is required in the Gospel, but as a Duty in the Law; For the Law requires 24. *Ad.* 3.

us in all things to obey God; that is comprehended in the first Precept, therefore it requires us to believe in Christ, God commanding it. Else not to believe, were no sin; *for sin is a transgression of the Law*, 1 Joh. 3. 4. Now as Believing is a Duty, so not-believing doth afford matter of Accusation, and cause of Condemnation: But as Believing is a Condition, so Not-believing doth only leave the Accusation otherwise made in force against us; and for sin, whereof we are accused and found guilty, leaves us to condemnation. Thus (I think) are those Texts to be understood, *John* 3. 18. and *ult.* Whereas you say, That *the Accusation may be three-fold*, truly in that manner it may be manifold: But indeed the Accusation is but one and the same, *viz.* that we are *Non-credentes*: For *Pagans* do not so much as appear, and *Hypocrites*, are *no* and * *Solifidians* do but appear to be Believers.

* Solifidians

Believers,

as believing is a receiving of Christ, and that is the believing by which we are justified.

Ibid. For the several Sentences from whence you argue;

Ad. 4. 1. You urged *Joh.* 5. 22. to prove that God Creator judgeth none. 2. How are any freed from the Sentence of the first Law, but by the benefit of the New Law? therefore I see no ground for that which you seem to insinuate, *viz.* That we must first be freed from the Sentence of one Law, and then of another. Indeed I do not see, That the Gospel hath any Sentence of Condemnation distinct from the Law; only it doth condemn Unbelievers, in that it doth not free them from that condemnation which by the Law is due unto them.

Ibid. That there is a sorer punishment, as of a distinct kind,

Ad. 5. than that Death threatned *Gen.* 3. you do not prove, neither (I presume) can it be proved. There are (I grant) several degrees of that Death, yet all of the same kind, *viz.* The loss of Heavenly Happiness, and the enduring of Hell-Torment. And if there must be a several Righteousness for every several degree of Punishment, there must be more Righteousnesses than you either do or can assign.

Ibid. I say as before, I do not think this, [*Thou art an Un-*

Ad. 6. *believer*] (I speak of Unbelief as a not-performing of the Gospel-Condition) to be a new Accusation, but only a

Plea

Plea why the former should stand good, *viz.* that we are sinners, and so to be condemned by the Law, because the benefit of the Gospel which we lay claim to, doth not belong unto us, we not performing the condition to that end required of us.

Whereas you say, [*We are devolved to the New Law before our Justification is compleat*]. Are we not devolved to it for the very beginning of our Justification? So again, [*Christ's Satisfaction is imputed to us for Righteousness*, &c. *But the New Covenant gives the personal Interest*]. Doth not the New Covenant give Christ also, in whom we have interest? I note these Passages, because your meaning in them perhaps is such as I do not sufficiently understand. *Ibid.*

I say still, Here is no occasion properly of a new Accusation, but only of a *removens prohibens*, a taking away of that which would hinder the force of the former Accusation. And so there is no new Righteousness of ours required unto Justification, but only a Condition, without which we cannot have interest in Christ's Righteousness, that thereby we may be justified. *Ibid.*

In your *Aphorisms* you speak only of a Two-fold Righteousness requisite unto Justification; now you speak of a Two-fold Justification necessary to be attained. But the Scripture speaks of Justification by Christ, and Justification by Faith, as of one and the same Justification, *Acts* 13. 39. *Rom.* 5. 1. *Ibid.*

The Second Cause, (as you call it) *viz.* [*Whether the Defendant have performed the condition of the New Covenant*] is indeed this, Whether he have any thing truly to alledge, why upon the former Accusation he should not be condemned? And so he must be justified indeed by producing his Faith, (and so his sincere Obedience to testifie his Faith) yet not as a new Righteousness of his own, but only as intitling him to Christ's Righteousness, as that whereby he must be justified. 25.

Whereas you speak of a Three-fold Guilt, *viz.* [1. *Reatus culpæ.* 2. *Reatus non-præstitæ Conditionis.* 3. *Reatus pœnæ propter non præstitam conditionem*]. 1. As *Omne malum est vel Culpæ, vel Pœnæ*, so *omnis reatus* seems to be so too. 2. The not-performing of a Condition, as a Condition, brings no new guilt of Punishment, (if it did, surely it were *Culpa*, and so the second Member *Ibid.*

ber falls in with the first) but only the loss of the Remedy, or Reward promised upon the performing of that Condition; though the not performing of the Condition as a Duty, will bring a new guilt of Punishment. 3. Therefore the *Reatus pœnæ* is not properly *ob non præstitam Conditionem*, but *ob culpam admissam*, which *Reatus* doth remain in force, because the Condition required for the removing of it, is not performed.

26. We must take heed of straining Law-terms too far in Matters of Divinity. I see not how the firmness of my title to Christ's Righteousness for Justification, may properly be called my Righteousness, whereby I am justified, though the firmness of that title may be questioned, and must be proved; yet if it prove false, it is not that properly which doth condemn, (I speak of the Meritorious Cause of Condemnation) but sin committed against the Law, is that which doth put into a state of Condemnation, and for want of that Title, there is nothing to free from Condemnation.

Ibid. The Obligation unto Punishment is not dissolved by Satisfaction made by Christ, as to Unbelievers, because for want of Faith, the Satisfaction of Christ is not imputed unto them.

Ibid. 1. For that far greater Punishment, which you speak of, I have said enough before. 2. Is that Non-liberation from former misery a distinct punishment from that misery? Though the former misery may be aggravated by neglect of that which would procure a liberation from it. If God had never made a New Covenant, there had certainly been a Non-liberation from that misery, which the breach of the first Covenant did bring upon us; and under that misery they must lie for ever, who neglect the Remedies provided for them; and as their neglect doth aggravate their sin, so will it encrease their Condemnation.

Ibid. The Immunity doth result from the New Covenant, the Penality from the Old, unto which Unbelievers are left, the New Covenant affording them no Remedy by reason of their unbelief: and the Penality of the Old Covenant is accidentally increased by the New Covenant, in that by neglect of its Remedy sin is increased.

Ibid. I am of this opinion, That the New Covenant hath no other Penality, but that it doth leave Unbelievers to the

Penality

Penality of the Old Covenant, and by accident increase the same.

If that Penality be but the same Death, it hath no more than the former; neither can that Act of Grace be properly said to appoint a new Punishment, but only to leave to the former Punishment, as not delivering from it. You speak indeed of Double Torments appointed by that Act for such as do reject it; but so (I think) the Similitude doth not hold. For I see not, that the Covenant of Grace doth so, but only (as I have said) leave some upon their not performing the Condition required of them, to the Punishment appointed by the Covenant of Works; which Punishment will be the sorer, as Sin by neglect of Grace offered is the greater. *Ibid.*

3. Though our Mediator do not believe, repent and obey for us, but we our selves must believe, repent and obey, yet it doth not follow that our believing, repenting and obeying, is that Righteousness by which we are justified. *Ibid.*

4. Though we be not guilty of not performing the Condition of the New Covenant, yet this is not properly our Righteousness, by which we are justified, though without it we cannot be justified, because not partake of Christ's Righteousness. 27.

5. The rejecting of Christ may be considered; 1. As the receiving of Christ is a Duty Commanded. 2. As the receiving of Christ is the Condition of Pardon and Salvation offered. In the former respect, the rejecting of Christ is properly a sin, and so against the Law, though aggravated by the Gospel, in that Christ is rejected notwithstanding all the benefit to be obtained by him. That the Law doth not speak of Christ, is nothing; for it speaks of obeying God in all his Commands, and so implicitly it speaks of receiving Christ, when God doth command it. In the latter respect the rejecting of Christ (I think) doth not properly bring a new guilt, but only continue and aggravate the former.

6. But *recurrit quæstio*, viz. Whether the New Law doth require the Condition as our Righteousness: it seems to me to require it only to that end, that Christ's Righteousness may be imputed unto us, and that so by that Righteousness we may be justified.

7. Faith, as a Duty, is a Conformity to the Law, though

though a partial and imperfect Conformity unto it, and so there's no being justified by it. As a Condition, it is a conformity to the Gospel, but no Righteousness by which we are justified, though a Condition upon performing of which we are justified by Christ's Righteousness.

8. I deny that there is any other condemnation of the Gospel, but only a not-freeing in some case from the condemnation of the Law.

9. The Condition being considered meerly as a Condition, and not as a Duty, to object that we have not performed the Condition, is not to bring a new Accusation, but only to take away the Plea, why the old Accusation should not prevail against us.

10. The performance of the Condition of the New Covenant, being designed to that use, which you mention, *viz.* [*to be the sinners self-denying acknowledgment of his sin and misery, and insufficiency to deliver himself*] it doth hence rather follow, that properly it is not our Righteousness, by which we are justified, though it be required of us to that end, that we may be justified by Christ's Righteousness.

11. That the Condition is not of so large extent as the Duty commanded, seems not to the purpose, the Question being of the Condition as a Condition, not as a Duty. Faith as a Duty (I grant) is part of our Personal Righteousness; but that is not it by which we are justified.

12. As the Condition is a Condition, and no more, so the performing of it is no *Justitia* at all: as it is a Duty, so indeed the performing of it is *Justitia particularis, & secundum quid*, as the performing of every Duty is: but such a *justitia* I dare not rely on for Justification. Whereas you say, *That Christ's Righteousness is not simply our Universal Righteousness*; it is true, if by [simply] you mean [*absolutè, & nullâ interpositâ conditione*] otherwise our Universal Righteousness it is, so that we have no need of any other Righteousness for our Justification, though we have need of some thing to that end, that we may partake of Christ's Righteousness, and be justified by it.

28. 13. The Gospel as distinct from the Law, doth shew us our Remedy; the Law as distinct from the Gospel, doth

doth prescribe unto us our Duty. Or if the Gospel also doth prescribe unto us our Duty, yet no other Duty, though upon other terms than the Law doth prescribe. However, though the performing of the Duty be in some sort our Righteousness, yet it is not that Righteousness by which we are justified. Still I distinguish of Believing considered as a Duty, and considered as a Condition. As a Duty, it is our Righteousness, but not that whereby we are justified; as a Condition, it is that whereby we are justified, but not our Righteousness; it is only that whereby we receive Righteousness, *viz.* the Righteousness of Christ, that Righteousness indeed by which we are justified. Whereas you say, [*The difference of the two Laws or Covenants, is the main ground which shews the necessity of a Two-fold Righteousness*]. The necessity of a Two-fold Righteousness is not denied, but only the necessity of a Two-fold Righteousness unto Justification.

This Two-fold Justification seems to be a new conceit. I remember not that you spake any thing of it in your *Aphorisms*; neither (I think) will it easily be granted because of your Positions and Suppositions, but rather they will be rejected, as inferring that which is not to be admitted. For truly where the Gospel doth speak of more Justifications than one, (in that sence as we treat of Justification) I am yet to seek. *Ibid.*

From a Two-fold Covenant you infer a Two-fold Justification. But is there a Two-fold Covenant, by which we are or may be justified? I conceive, we are justified only by the New Covenant. For *by the Deeds of the Law* (the Old Covenant) *shall no flesh be justified*, Rom. 3. 20. See also *Acts* 13. 39. *Ibid.*

1. To be accused as an Unbeliever, and a Rejecter of Christ, &c. is to be accused as a sinner, and as one that did not continue in all things written in the Law to do them. For else Unbelief and rejecting of Christ were no sin; that Christ is not spoken of in the Law, is nothing, as I have shewed before. 2. That Accusation (that a Man is an Unbeliever, and a Rejecter of Christ) if it be made good, doth leave a Man to the Law, and makes all its Accusations to be in force against him, with aggravation of his Sin for contempt of Mercy. *Ibid.*

For

29. For the Authors which you cite, I can examine but few of them, because I have them not. *Bradshaw* (so *De Justif.* c. 24. §. 21. far as I see) makes nothing for you. He saith, *Bona opera quodammodo justificare dicuntur, quòd fidem, ipsamque adeò justificationem nostram arguendo, ac comprobando, utramque ista ratione justificent.* This is but what others say, That Faith doth justifie the Person, and Works justifie the Faith: and that is indeed no more than what all Protestants do say, *viz.* That Works declare and manifest Faith to be such as whereby the Person is justified: and that therefore a Man is said to be justified by Works, because thereby he appears to have Faith, whereby he is justified.

Ibid. §. 23. Again he saith, *Obedientia non minùs quàm ipsa (ex quâ oritur) fides ad salutem æternam est nobis necessaria, utpote sine quâ justitiam Christi imputatam prodesse nobis posse spes nulla existat.* This is but what Protestants generally acknowledge, That Obedience is necessary as a Fruit of Justifying Faith; so that without Obedience it is in vain to think of being justified by Christ's Righteousness: Yet is not our Obedience therefore a Righteousness, by which we are justified.

Ibid. §. 25. Again he saith, *Cujuslibet Christiani, quicum actu Deus in gratiam redit, duplex est Justitia; Imputata una, Inhærens altera.* But he doth not say, That we are justified by Inherent, as well as by Imputed Righteousness: He is as far from that as other Protestants generally are; and other Protestants generally are as ready to assert the necessity of that Two-fold Righteousness, as he is.

Ibid. §. 26. Again he saith, *Per justitiam Christi nobis imputatam non possimus dici absolutè sive omni modo justi*, &c. He means, We are not freed from future Obedience, though we be freed from the guilt of Disobedience. This (except Libertines) none, I presume, will deny. But all this, as to the Controversie betwixt us about a Two-fold Righteousness requisite unto Justification, is (that I see) just nothing. But concerning *Bradshaw*, and the places which you point at in him, I observe, that §. 21. is twice so figured, and therefore which of the two you did intend, may be a question. I before noted what is in the former; but in the latter there is something, which peradventure you intended, though I judg it as little to your

your purpose as the rest. He saith, *Nova Nostra Obedientia pro gradu suo, & mensurâ, etiam justitia nostra dicitur, quâ & formaliter, inhærenter, habitualiter, sivè ex operibus justi (pro ipsius modulo) coram Deo etiam verè dicamur, utpote cujus ratione pro justis ex parte à Deo ipso censeamur, cujusque intuitu etiam in foro divino aliquo modo (si id opus esset) justificari possimus.* But, 1. you see what mincing of the matter here is; [*Pro gradu suo & mensurâ: Pro ipsius modulo: ex parte: Aliquomodo: si id opus esset*]. This is not to the Point we have in hand, who speak of universal and entire Justification. 2. Here he makes against you; for he clearly makes Inherent Righteousness imperfect, [*cujus ratione pro justis ex parte à Deo censemur*] whereas you hold all Righteousness to be perfect, or none at all. What you mean by citing *Wotton de Reconcil.* part 1. lib. 2. cap. 18. I cannot imagine, for nothing do I there see for you, but much against you, though touching other Particulars in debate betwixt us. As in the very beginning of the Chapter; *Ex efficientibus Justificationis causis reliqua est Fides, quam Instrumenti locum obtinere diximus.* And the title of the Chapter is, *Quomodo Fides Causa Instrumentalis Justificationem Nostram operetur.* And *pag.* 100. he cites and approves that of *Downam, Fides sola est, quæ nobis jus tribuit ad omnes Dei promissiones in Evangelio consequendas,* &c. And *pag.* 103. that of our Church; *Nihil ex hominis parte flagitatur ad ipsius justificationem, præter veram & vivam fidem.* And immediately after he adds; *Neque tamen hæc Fides spem, dilectionem, timorem, pœnitentiam excludere censenda est, quasi ad eum, qui justificandus est, non pertinerent, sed hæc omnia ab officio justificandi (N. B.) significantur penitùs excludi. Atque hoc quidem justificandi munus soli Fidei convenire, his rationibus ostendo,* &c. The rest of the Chapter is taken up with those Reasons. Now what there is for your purpose, judg you. The next place which you refer me to, is more punctually cited, *viz. part 2. lib. 2. cap. 35. pag.* 383. but neither there do I find any thing that makes for you. He there answers *Bellarmine*'s Arguments, whereby he would prove, That *Fides est solus assensus, non etiam fiducia:* But what is this *ad rhombum?* I know not whether you may lay hold on those words,

words, *Fidem Justificantem, sive quatenus Justificat, non esse unam virtutem, nec ullam quidem virtutem, sed justificare omninò, & solummodò ex officio & loco, qua Deus misericors illi sponte & liberè concessit, ut dixi parte* 1. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 28. So it is printed, but it should be *cap.*18. for there are but nineteen Chapters of that Book. What you can gather from this (if this were it you aimed at) I cannot tell, especially he referring us to the other place before mentioned, where there is much against you, but nothing (I think) for you. And as little for your purpose do I meet with in *part* 2. *lib.* 1. *cap.* 7. *pag.* 144. where he only saith, *Accedat etiam oportet, ut idones simus, quibus aditus ad Cœlum patear, habitualis justitia sive Sanctitas, de quâ,* &c. *Mat.* 5. 8. *Denique vitæ etiam sanctimoniâ, & bonis operibus opus est, ut Regnum Cœleste comparemus,* Heb. 12. 14. Matth. 25. 34, 35. But doth he say, That this Habitual Righteousness (which he maketh all one with Holiness, therein opposing you as I do) is requisite unto Justification? Otherwise that it is requisite, Who doth question? Whereas you next cite *part.* 2. *lib.* 1. *cap.* 5. *p.* 127. *n.*3,4. I doubt whether you did well observe what the Author there meaneth. He only answereth an Argument of *Hemingius*, denying that which (he saith) *Hemingius* supposeth, *viz. Eandem justitiam esse viam ad vitam æternam, cum in Lege, tum in Evangelio.* But of a Two-fold Righteousness he there makes no mention; not (I say) of a Two-fold Righteousness required of us at all, much less required of us, that thereby we may be justified. He saith indeed, *Quid enim si Lex Dei in decalogo sit norma illius justitiæ, quæ est via Vitæ Eternæ? Si præter hanc in Lege præscripta sit alia via in Evangelio constituta, quid impediet, quo minùs justificetur quispiam sine Legis impletione?* He doth not mean, That the Righteousness prescribed in the Law, is one Righteousness, and the Righteousness constituted in the Gospel another Righteousness, whereby we are justified; but that we are justified only by this latter, and not at all by the other. He was far from thinking of your Legal and Evangelical Righteousness, as being both necessary unto Justification; he only asserts Evangelical Righteousness as necessary in that respect, which Righteousness he makes to consist meerly in remission of

sins.

sins. See *part.* 1. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 2. *n.* 12. & *cap.* 3. *per totum.* To the very same purpose (*i.e.* nothing at all to yours) is that *Ibid. cap.* 6. *p.* 138. *n.* 2. where he taxeth *Hemingius* for taking it as granted, *Nullam esse justitiam, vel injustitiam, nisi in Lege præstitâ, vel non præstitâ:* And then he saith, *Nam si alia sit justitia, qua Lege non contineatur, fieri potest, ut alia etiam sit vita Æterna Vita consequenda.* He doth not grant (as you seem to understand him) that *Justitia, qua in Lege continetur est una justitia, qua ad Justificationem à nobis requiritur*; for that indeed he denies, and saith, That there is another Righteousness now in the Gospel ordained for that end; and remission of sins (as I said) he makes to be that Righteousness, even the only Righteousness by which we are formally justified. Immediately after indeed he adds that which I cannot allow; *Verum nec peccatum quidem Legis in Decalogo cancellis circumscribitur.* This is not directly to the Point now in hand; yet because it may reflect upon it, and somewhat we have about it afterward; I therefore think meet to note it by the way, and say, That if it be as he saith, then (it seemeth) St. *John* did not give us a full definition of sin, when he said, *Sin is a transgression of the Law*; but of that more hereafter. *Wotton*'s Argument is of small force; *Fides* (*inquit*) *in Christum crucifixum non præcipitur in Lege:* but I have before him, shewed that it is otherwise. He himself presently after cites that, 1 *John* 3. 23. [*This is his Commandment, That we believe*, &c.] Now the Law contained in the Decalogue, requires us to do whatsoever God commandeth; for if we do not so, we do not make him our only Lord God, as the Law requireth. That the Apostle doth oppose (as he saith) Faith to the Law, *Gal.* 3. 12. makes nothing for him. For Faith, as a Duty, is required in the Law, though as a Condition it be required only in the Gospel. Neither doth that advantage him, which he also objecteth, That the Law hath nothing to do with Christ as Mediator, *Gal.* 5. 4. For though the Gospel only hold out Christ as Mediator to be believed in; yet Christ being so held out, the Law doth require us to believe in him. For the Law doth require a belief of every Truth that God doth reveal, and a performance of every thing that God doth enjoyn. Now for *Lud. de Dieu*, If the Justification which 1 *Joh.* 3. 4.

he speaks of, *Quâ ut sanctificati ac regeniti absolvimur à falsis Diaboli & improborum criminationibus*, be meant of some particular Acts, of which we are accused, it is but such a Justification as the Reprobates themselves may partake of, who may be accused of some things whereof they are not guilty. See *Bradshaw de Justif. cap.* 25. If it be meant of our estate in general, (as I suppose it is) then this is indeed no distinct Justification, but only a confirming of the other. For in vain do we pretend to be justified by Faith, (by which alone *de Dieu* grants we are justified) so as through Christ to be freely acquitted from the guilt of our sins, if yet we remain unregenerate and unsanctified. By the way I observe, That *de Dieu*'s words are against you, [Jacobus *non agit de Justificatione, quæ partim fide, partim operibus peragatur*]. Thus much I had said in reference to this Author before I had him upon the Epistles; but now that I have him, I shall speak more fully to him, or to you of him, from that other place to which you remit me, *viz.* his Notes on *Rom.* 8. 4. There he speaks likewise of a Two-fold Righteousness, and of a Two-fold Justification, yet so as but little to patronize your Cause. Besides Imputed Righteousness, which we have in Christ, there is also (he saith, and who doth not?) an Inherent Righteousness which we have in our selves. The former Righteousness (he saith) is that, *Quâ nos Deus, etsi in nobis ipsis Legi adhuc difformes, plenè tamen, ipsius etiam Legis Testimonio, justificat, eique pro omnino conformibus habet in capite Christo: de quâ justificatione Apostolus supra*, cap. 3. & 4. & 5. *multis disputavit. Altera est, de quâ*, Rom. 6. 13. Ephes. 4. 24. 1 Joh. 3. 7. *Quâ nos Deus per regenerationem in nobis etiam ipsis Lege ex parte conformatos, ex parte nunc justificat, & indies justificat magis ac magis, prout incrementum capit regeneratio, ac justificabit plenè, ubi perfectio advenerit, de quâ Justificatione agitur*, Jac. 2. 21, 24. Apoc. 22. 11. Mat. 12. 37. 1 Reg. 8. 32. *Hanc justificationem Opera Legis ingrediuntur; ut primam constituit sola Fides*, i. e. *justitia Christi fide imputata, non opera; sic alteram constituunt opera, non fides.* Here, 1. he makes Inherent Righteousness imperfect, and so also the Justification which doth arise from it. By this Righteousness we are but *Legi ex parte conformati, &*

ex

ex parte nunc justificati: But Imputed Righteousness, and Justification by it, he acknowledgeth to be perfect: hereby we are *plenè justificati; tanquam Legi plenè conformes in capite Christo.* 2. He makes Faith only, *i. e.* (as he explains it) the Righteousness of Christ imputed by Faith, that whereby we are fully and perfectly justified. Now you make all Righteousness, as such, perfect; for otherwise you make it to be no Righteousness if it be imperfect. And you make Faith and Works to concur unto the same Justification, though you distinguish of the Inchoation, Continuation and Consummation of it. You also make Faith properly taken to be the Righteousness (though not the only Righteousness) by which we are justified. So that *de Dieu*'s Opinion and yours are much different.

Again, *Sola Fides* (*inquit*) *amplectens istam obedientiam* (*sc. Christi*) *imputatur in justitiam*, Ibid. *p.* 104.

And pag. 105. *Fidei imputatio est in justitiam perfectam, qualis est Obedientia Christi. Operum imputatio in imperfectam, qualia sunt ipsa Opera in hâc vitâ.*

And *pag.* 109. he cites *Bucer* in *Colloq. Ratisb.* as agreeing with him, and saying thus, *Dixeramus nos, secutì Apostolum, & omnem Scripturam, duplicem esse Sanctorum justitiam, quâ justi sunt coram Deo & hominibus. Unam Christi, perfectam, quâ illis spes omnis gratiæ Dei, & salutis vitæque sempiternæ tota nititur. Alteram in ipsis per Spiritum Christi inchoatum, quâ confidere non debent, propterea quòd ea imperfecta semper est, dum hîc vivunt, & Deo non nisi ex liberali & infinitâ ejus misericordiâ, & merito Christi probari non potest. Hâc justitia nemo justificatur coram Deo justificatione vitæ.---- Justitiam hanc Inchoatam sentimus esse quidem veram & vivam Justitiam, Dei præclarum & eximium donum, vitamque novam in Christo hâc justitiâ constare, omnesque Sanctos hac ipsâ quoque justitia justos esse, & coram Deo, & coram hominibus, & propter eam Sanctos quoque à Deo justificari justificatione Operum*, i. e. *comprobari eos à Deo, laudari, & remunerari. Attamen quamlibet hæc justitia sit vera ac viva, & suo etiam modo (N. B.) justificans, tamen non esse ejusmodi, non sic veram vivam & solidam, ut quisquam Sanctorum justificari ea posit justificatione*

vitæ, multo minus ut sit ipsa justitia vel justificatio vitæ.

Thus then *de Dieu* in the Matter it self doth not differ from other Protestant-Writers, who generally hold, That the Righteousness of Christ imputed to us, is that by which we are fully and perfectly justified; and yet we must also have Inherent Righteousness, which will justifie us in some sort, but not fully and perfectly, because it self is imperfect.

For *Placeus* I have him not; but because you alledge his words, I will say something to him. He speaks indeed of a Two-fold Accusation, and of a Two-fold Justification. But, 1. he seems to differ from me and others only *modo loquendi*. For he saith, *Ab accusatione priore (qua sc. objicitur nos esse peccatores) sola fide justificamur; qua Christi gratiam & justitiam amplectimur: à posteriore, (qua objicitur nos esse infideles) justificamur etiam operibus, quatenus ius Fides (N. B.) ostenditur.* This seems to be in effect the same with that of *Maccovius, Conciliationem hîc (inter* Paulum & Jacobum) *hanc ponunt Theologi, & quidem ex Scriptura, sola Fides nos justificat apprehensivè, opera declarativè.* 2. To speak properly, they are not (I think) two distinct Accusations. For to omit this, That to be *Infideles*, is to be *Peccatores*; and so the one Accusation doth include the other: To omit this (I say) the latter Accusation is but a re-inforcing of the former. Thou art a Sinner, saith the Accuser, and therefore to be condemned. Not so, saith the Party accused, for I am a Believer, and therefore justified. Hereupon the Accuser replies, Nay, it is not so as thou pretendest, thou art indeed no Believer, therefore the guilt of thy sins is upon thee, and thou art under condemnation. All this is but one Accusation, prosecuted and confirmed against a Plea made against it. If they were distinct Accusations, then we might be freed from the one, and yet be condemned by the other: but it is here quite otherwise. For the force of the former Accusation doth depend upon the latter; neither are we freed from the former, except we be freed from the latter; whereas you seem to carry it so, as if we were first justified from the former Accusation, and then were again to be justified from the latter: this seems to be the result of your Opinion.

De Fide Justif. Disp. 12.

1. Be-

1. Because I grant Faith to be required of us, that so Christ's Righteousness may become ours, do I therefore make Faith it self to be our Righteousness, *viz.* that whereby we are fully justified. A part of Inherent Righteousness (I grant) Faith is, by which we may be justified in some measure; but that is not the Justification here enquired of. 2. You should not put me to prove, That your Assertion is without Scripture; it is sufficient for me to say it, until you alledge Scripture for it. 3. Christ's Satisfaction is solely and wholly our Righteousness, whereby we are justified from all Condemnation, though except we believe in him, we cannot enjoy that benefit by him; See 2 *Cor.* 5. *ult.* and *Acts* 13. 39. 4. The New Covenant doth hold out unto us Christ's Righteousness to be made ours by Faith, that so we may be freed from the Condemnation of the Old Covenant, to which Condemnation we are left, if we believe not; and our Condemnation will be so much the sorer, by how much the sin in neglecting so great Salvation is the greater. 5. I confess indeed that there is more than Faith in the Condition of the New Covenant, but not as to Justification. For that which you add, [James *saith, We are justified by Works, and Christ by our Words*]; the question is not, Whether we be said to be justified by our Works or Words; but how and in what sense we are said to be so justified. There is a Particular Justification, and a Declarative Justification; thus we are justified by our Works and Words: but a full and formal Justification is only by Christ's Righteousness through Faith imputed unto us. 6. To say, That we are healed partly by the Medicine, and partly by the Application, I still think to be improper; neither do you bring any thing, whereby to shew the propriety of it. The Application of the Medicine is indeed requisite, yet it is the Medicine properly that doth heal, though not except there be an Application of it. Common Speech is not always Proper Speech; neither can any that are acquainted with Scripture, and know how to distinguish between Proper and Improper Speeches, think it strange that there are improper Speeches found in Scripture. What will you say of those, [*This is my Body*] [*The Rock was Christ*] and a hundred such-like? For Rules of Logick, if you had made use of any, I might have considered of them. 7. May 30. (*p.* 36.)

not a Similitude illustrate, though there be such a difference as you speak of, betwixt that from which it is fetched, and that to which it is applied? But why do you joyn Repentance and Obedience with Faith in point of Justification; I speaking only of Faith, and you as yet having said nothing for the joint interest of the other? 8. In your *Aphorisms* you plainly assert two distinct Righteousnesses, as requisite unto Justification; that there you make them subordinate, is more than I observe. But though Faith be subordinate unto Christ's Satisfaction in the matter of Justification, yet that we are justified by Faith as a distinct Righteousness, I cannot yeeld, no more than that the Application of a Medicine is a distinct Medicine by which one is healed. I am glad that you plainly disclaim a Coordination of Christ's Righteousness and Faith in the Work of Justification: But if they be but subordinate, then (me-thinks) they should not be two distinct Righteousnesses, by which we are justified. I see not how we can be justified (I speak of an Universal Justification, opposite to all condemnation, that which *Bucer* calls *Justificationem Vitæ*) both by the Righteousness of Christ imputed to us, and also by our own personal Righteousness. You say, [*A Man having a Medicine, and not applying it, may properly be said to die for want of Application*]; but to speak properly, I think, It is not the want of Application of the Medicine, but the Disease that doth kill the Man: So though a Man wanting Faith shall be condemned, yet take Faith meerly as a Condition, not as a Duty, it is not properly the want of Faith, but Sin that is the cause of his Condemnation; though his want of Faith may as aggravate his Sin, so increase his Condemnation.

Apud. Lud. de Dieu in *Rom.* 8. 4.

Ibid. 20. 108.

That I speak your words, is more than I do know. How Christ's Righteousness may be called our Legal Righteousness, I shewed by *Rom.* 10. 4. viz. as serving us instead of that Righteousness which the Law required of us, and for want of which the Law otherwise would have condemned us. Neither did I blame you meerly for calling Christ's Satisfaction our Legal Righteousness, but for making another Righteousness of our own, which you call our Evangelical Righteousness, necessary unto Justification. Now also you overlook that, which I alledged about Christ's Satisfaction, as being our Evangelical Righteousness. 1. Doth

(*p.* 36.)

1. Doth the Old Covenant prescribe Christ's Satisfaction as our Righteousness? You said a little before, [*I do not think, that Christ's Righteousness of Satisfaction is that which the Law required.*]; as if I said, That the Law did require it; whereas I meant only this, That the Law required Satisfaction, and Christ made it for us, so that Christ's Satisfaction serveth us instead of that Righteousness which the Law required of us, and so may be called our Legal Righteousness. But the New Covenant doth hold out Christ's Righteousness to be apprehended by us, and made ours by Faith, that so thereby we may be justified. Where the Scripture speaks of a Two-fold Righteousness so as you do, or how this makes for the unfolding of the main Doctrine, or tends to heal our Breaches, I do not see: You affirm these things, but do not prove them. 2. What plain ground you laid down in your *Aphorisms* for that Two-fold Righteousness, I do not know: What I could observe any way Argumentative, I was willing to examine, and so am still. *Ibid.* *Ib.* 110.

1. If it imply Blasphemy, to say, That Christ repented, and believed for us; Doth it follow that Faith or Repentance is our Righteousness, by which we are justified? Can nothing be required of us, and performed by us, but it must therefore be our Righteousness, and by it as our Righteousness we must be justified? 2. The Scriptures which I alledged, (viz. *Rom.* 9. 29. & 10. 6. *Gal.* 5. 5. and *Rom.* 3. 22.) do sufficiently distinguish Faith from that Righteousness, whereby we are justified, and shew it to be only a means, whereby we partake of Christ's Righteousness, and so by that Righteousness of Christ are justified. The Argument (I think) is good, notwithstanding any thing you say unto it. Faith is only a means whereby Christ's Righteousness is imputed unto us unto Justification: Therefore it is not that Righteousness by which we are justified, *Rivet* speaking of the Remonstrants saith, *Volunt igitur Fidem cum operibus venire in partem justitiæ debitæ, & Fidem justificare, non Relativè, ut organum apprehendens objectum, sed Inhærenter*, &c. *Hoc iniquitatis mysterium*, &c. 31. 21. 111. *De Fide Justif.* §. 15. & 16

1. You might easily know what I meant by [Simply and Absolutely justified in the sight of God], if you did well consider the other Members of the distinction, *viz.* to be wholly freed from all Condemnation; the same *Ibid.*

that Mr. *Bradshaw* meant by Universal Justification: You know sufficiently the distinction betwixt *Simpliciter* or *Absolutè*, & *secundum quid*. *Bradshaw* having said, *Hoc modo* (*sc. justificatione particulari*) *non Electi soli, sed & Reprobi ipsi coram Deo Justificari possunt*: Adds immediately, *Neutri vero eorum absolute hoc modo justificari possunt.* ---- *Hoc modo justificari non est penitus à peccati reatu, sed ab hujus vel illius peccati imputatione injustâ liberari.* 2. Comparative Righteousness I shewed to be but a less degree of Unrighteousness: but Ironical Righteousness is down-right Unrighteousness, whereas a less Unrighteousness in comparison of a greater, is a kind of Righteousness. *Minus malum respectu majoris habet rationem boni.* 3. I do not deny the Righteousness of Faith, though I deny Faith to be that Righteousness by which we are justified. Though our Salvation depend upon our Faith, and sincere Obedience, yet are we not therefore justified by Obedience, but *Declarativè*, as it is the fruit of Justifying Faith; nor by Faith, but *Apprehensivè*, as by it we apprehend and receive Christ's Righteousness.

Ibid. & 32. 1. I never doubted, much less denied Faith to be a part of Inherent Righteousness. 2. It is indeed a strange Righteousness, that will not justifie so far forth as it will reach: but it is not strange to Protestant-Divines, that Inherent Righteousness cannot reach so far as to justifie in that sense as we speak of Justification. *Illud concedimus*, (*inquit* Daven.) *esse in omnibus justificatis justitiam quandam inherentem, quam si formalem causam statuant Justificationis*, (*liceat enim vocabulum procudere*) *non repugnabimus: sed predicta Justificationis, quæ respondet stricto examini Cœlestis Judicis, nec formalis, nec meritoria esse ullo modo potest.* And he lays down these two Positions; *De Justif. Habit. cap. 22.*

Ibid. 1. *Christi Mediatoris, in nobis habitantis, atque per Spiritum sese nobis unientis, perfectissima Obedientia, est formalis causa justificationis Nostræ, utpote quæ ex donatione Dei & applicatione Fidei fit nostra.* 2. *Justitia per Spiritum Christi nobis impressa & inherens, non est formalis causa, per quam stamus justificati, hoc est, per quam liberati judicamur à damnatione, & acceptati ad vitam æternam, tanquam eâdem digni per hanc qualitatem nobis inherentem.* That you may not catch at the word [*digni*], he afterward expresseth it thus; *Atque hic ne inanem de vocabulis*

Ibid. cap. 26.

cabulis velitationem instituamus, illud præmittendum nos per formalem causam Justificationis nihil aliud intelligere, quam illud, per quod stamus in conspectu Dei à damnatione liberati, innocentes, gratificati, & ad vitam æternam acceptati. And the whole Chapter is to prove that *Inherens Justitia non est formalis causa Justificationis Nostræ coram Deo.* But it is a needless labour to cite Authors to this purpose. For what more common with our Divines (I speak of such as are of chief note) than to acknowledg Inherent Righteousness, and yet to deny that we are justified by it? What you mean, when you yeeld that we are not universally justified by Faith, I do not well understand. For if you mean (as you seem to do) that we are not freed by it from the Punishment of the Old Covenant, but only from the Punishment of the New Covenant; 1. I know no Punishment of the New Covenant, but a leaving to the Punishment of the Old Covenant, with an aggravation of it for contempt of Mercy offered. 2. Faith, though not as our Righteousness, yet as the means whereby we partake of Christ's Righteousness, doth free us from the Punishment of the Old Covenant, *viz.* Death. For *the Just shall live by Faith*, Rom. 1. 17. And in that sense Faith doth universally justifie us. For *being justified by Faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ*, Rom. 5. 1. Whereas you speak of justifying against the Accusation of Non-performing the Condition of the New Covenant; I must still tell you, That taking the Condition meerly as a Condition, the Accusation of non-performing it, is but a confirming a former Accusation of being guilty of the breach of the Old Covenant, and therefore to be condemned, as having no relief from the New Covenant, the Condition of it being not performed. 3. If I do ill oppose the Righteousness whereby we are justified, and the Righteousness whereby we are sanctified, as if the same thing might not be both; then welfare the Papists, who confound Justification and Sanctification. *Duræus* the Jesuite, in his Defence of *Campian*, saith, *Nova hæc*, Whitakere, *Theologia est, nos per gratiam infusam, vitæ novitatem ac sanctificationem adipisci, minimè tamen justificari. At quæ te, obsecro, Scriptura docuit Justificationem à Sanctificatione distinguere?* The same Righteousness

Duræus Adversus Whitak.

that

that doth sanctifie, cannot also justifie; because that Righteousness, which doth sanctifie, doth it but in part; but that which doth justifie, must do it fully, or else it is to little purpose. For (as *Bradshaw* observes) *even the Reprobate as well as others, may have a particular Justification.* 4. The Texts which I cited, (*Luk.*1.75. *Ephes.*4.24. *Psal.*147.17. *Apoc.*22.11.) seem to me to make the terms [*Righteousness and Holiness, Righteous and Holy*] *equipollent:* and that Text, *Psal.*145.17. speaks not of God's People, but of God himself, which (it seems) you did not observe. And why should you call it *tautologizing*, when two words are joined together as Synonima's? What is more frequent in Scripture than this? It hath more shew of tautology, when divers sentences importing the same thing, are joyned together; which yet is very usual. And as the Scriptures, so also our Divines do promiscuously use the words [Righteousness] and [Holiness]. *Davenant, Hanc ergo qualitatem justitiæ, sive Sanctitatis, quam Deus imprimit hominibus renatis, negamus esse causam formalem justificationis,* &c. So *Ames. Non excluditur justitia, seu Sanctitas inherens,* &c. 5. The Matter of our Righteousness, is that which is conformable to the Law: *Justum est, quod est secundum Legem; Injustum, quod contra Legem*; and so by your own confession is the matter of our Holiness.

De Justif. cap. 25.

De Just. Habit. cap. 26. *Bell. Ener.* Tom. 4. l. 6. c. 1. p. 126.

32. 1. They are no vulgar Divines, that say, Our Inherent Righteousness is imperfect; yea, and make this one principal Argument to prove that we are not justified by Inherent Righteousness. *Fides, & spes, & Charitas* (*inquit* Whitakerus) *nos justos aliquo modo faciunt, sed inchoatè, non absolute. Lud. de Dieu,* and in him *Bucer* were cited before. Hear now *Davenant*; *Ipsa* (*inquit*) *justitia inhærens, in se considerata, qualis reperitur in viatoribus, imperfecta est, atque caret illis perfectionis gradibus, qui ad justificationem perfectam necessario requiruntur. Vide etiam* Ibid. cap. 23. *ad Arg.* 6. Thus also *Amesius*; *Justitia quâ justificatur homo coram Deo, debet esse perfecta: Sed justitia nobis inhærens, non est talis. Ergo. Wotton* speaks not only for himself, but also for others, even our chiefest Divines; *Lutherus, Melancthon, Calvinus, & Chemnitius, eâ potissimum causâ* (*N. B.*) *nos infusâ & inhærente justi-*

Contra Camp. ad Rat. 8. p. 178. *De Justif. Habit.* cap. 26. Arg. 4. *Contra Bellar.* Tom. 4. lib. 6. c. 1. Arg. 11. *De Recon.* par. 2. l. 1. c. 19.

ti â

stitiâ justificari non posse contendunt, quòd illa in nobis ita imperfecta sit, ut in Dei conspectum, cum ad judicandum accedat, prodire non audeat.

And again; *Nihil profectò causæ erat, cur Vasquez in* 1. 2. *Disp.* 202. *n.* 26. *tantopere hunc argumento confideret, ut illo potissimum niteretur; Perfectio nostræ justitiæ (inquit* Vasques*) non debet probari ex quibusdam Scripturæ testimoniis, in quibus commendatur perfecta & integra charitas, sed potiùs ex illis, in quibus docemur nobis inesse justitiam. Nam justitia non est, quæ vera, & perfecta non est.* *Ibid.* cap. 23.

And again; *Justitia nostra habitualis nobis à Deo infusa, non est perfecta.* And again; *Respondent nostri Theologi justitiam illam habitualem esse imperfectam.* I will add one more, whom both you and I reverence, *viz.* Mr. *Blake*, He having spoken of some (he names none, but you know, I suppose, whom he meaneth) who grant Holiness to be imperfect, but will have Righteousness (our Personal Righteousness) by all means to be perfect; he adds, [This and much more to assert a personal perfect Inherent Righteousness, as is said] all which, as it is here held out, to me is new, and I must confess my self in ignorance all over. I never take Imperfect Righteousness to imply any such contradiction, no more than Imperfect Holiness. *Isaiah* (I am sure) saith, *All our Righteousnesses are as filthy Rags*, &c. See more afterward. *Ibid.* lib. 2. c. 16. & c. 19. Of the Covenant, ch. 16. p. 10

2. I take Righteousness to be a Conformity to the Law, which Conformity may be more or less perfect, as one may more or less come up to the Rule set before him. If I over-slipt any thing in your *Aphorisms*, you might have directed me to it; otherwise to search for it, may prove both a tedious and a fruitless labour.

That one thing may be more or less like another, is most evident, so that if all the wit in the World should conspire against it, yet one might as easily demonstrate it, as he did, who to prove *dari motum*, when one had disputed against it, rose up and walked. Is not the Similitude sometime more, sometime less, that is betwixt Parents and Children, and betwixt Children of the same Parents, especially Twinns? and so in other things? To deny this, what is it but to put out mens eyes, or to bid defiance unto common sense? *Relata recipiunt magis & minus*, *Ibid.* *Alio alio amicior*, & *similior*, Alsted. *Metaph. lib.* 2. *c.* 5. *Log. l.* 1. *c.* 7

minus, saith *Burgersdicius*. Yet he saith, *Recipere magis & minus non convenit omnibus Relatis.* Surely there is great difference betwixt *Similitudo* and *Æqualitas*, so that neither *Scheibler* nor any Man else must think to carry it so, as if there were *eadem utriusque ratio*; so that because *Æqualitas consistit in indivisibili*; therefore *similitudo* must do so too. Perfect Righteousness indeed is *quadam Æqualitas*, not simply all Righteousness. That an Action cannot be conform to the Precept, except it be perfectly conform, you must prove as well as assert, before I can assent. I could yet see no reason to doubt of that which Mr. *Blake* saith, [*As an Image carrying an imperfect resemblance of its Samplar, is an Image; so Conformity imperfectly answering to the Rule, is Conformity likewise*].

Of the Coven.

c.16.p.111

33. 1. You do not well to confound Conformity and Equality. And though the Law require perfect Conformity, which none can perform, it doth not follow that imperfect Conformity is none at all. If a perfect Conformity to the Law could be performed by us, then we should be justified by the Law, which we cannot be: yet the Regenerate conform to the Law in some measure, and so it behoves us to do; For *then shall I not be ashamed, when I have respect to all thy Commandments*, Ps.119.6. I let pass your Second and Third. Ad 4. I do not speak of Qualification considered absolutely, but in reference to the Rule. Mr. *Blake* saith well, [*Neither do I understand how Holiness should be imperfect, taken materially, and Righteousness perfect, taken formally, in reference to a Rule. We may (for ought I know) as well make Holiness formal, and refer it to a Rule, and Righteousness material, in an absolute consideration, without reference to any Rule at all. And in such consideration I do not know how there can be perfection or imperfection either in Holiness or Righteousness; it is as they come up, or fall short of the Rule, that they have the denomination of perfection or imperfection*]. Holiness and Righteousness are opposite unto sin: therefore formally considered, they are a Conformity to the Rule, as Sin is a deviation from it. The Conformity therefore of our Actions and Dispositions to the Rule is not (as you say) the matter of our Righteousness, but (as I conceive) it is the form; and our Actions and Dispositi-

Loc. cit.

ons

ons themselves are the matter of it, *viz.* of our Personal and Inherent Righteousness; and so of our Holiness. The Rule of Righteousness (to which as we conform more or less, we are more or less righteous) is the Law, the sum whereof is contained in the Decalogue: therefore it is said, That Believers are under the Law as a Rule, though not under it as a Covenant. For *Pœna Evangelica*, of which you speak, I have said enough of it before.

To your Queries and Objections, I answer, Ad 1. Christ doth justifie the Unrighteous, God doth justifie the Ungodly, *Rom.* 4. 5. But how? They were unrighteous and ungodly before they were justified; they are not so when they are justified, though it is not their Personal Righteousness or Godliness whereby they are justified. *Know ye not that the Unrighteous shall not inherit*, &c. *And such were some of you, but you are washed*, &c. 1 *Cor.* 6. 9, 10, 11. That of *Tarnovius*, cited by Mr. *Ball*, is useful here; *In Scriptura sæpe res dicitur quod paulò antè fuit, ut cæci vident, surdi audiunt, claudi ambulant*, &c. Ad 2. The Law doth not justifie any but such as are perfectly righteous; therefore they that are imperfectly, though truly righteous, cannot be justified by it. *Sumus verè justi*, (saith *Davenant*) *non putativè, si respiciamus justitiam nostram habitualem: sed hæc vera justitia est adhuc inchoata & imperfecta.* And again, *Sanctificationem nostram non putativam & fictitiam, sed veram & realem statuimus.* Bellarmini *autem Dialecticam, qui inde concludit nos justificari justitiâ inherente, putativam arbitramur, & fictitiam.* And why should not Imperfect Righteousness be acknowledged True Righteousness, as well as Imperfect Holiness is acknowledged True Holiness? That of the Apostle, *Ephes.* 4. 24. [*in Righteousness and true Holiness*]; or, as the Original hath it, [*in righteousness and holiness of Truth*], attributes Truth as well to Righteousness, (though imperfect) as to Holiness. *Genitivus Veritatis* (saith *Calvin* on the place) *loco Epitheti positus est, qui tam justitiæ, quam sanctitati convenit.* Ad 3. You seem quite to mistake the meaning of that in *James* 2. 10. It makes nothing against an Imperfect Righteousness, but only shews, That respect must be had to one Precept as well as to another: because

Ibid. & 34.

Of the Coven. p. 219.

De Just. Hab. c. 23. ad Arg. 7.

Ibid. ad Arg. 8.

cause though a Man should keep the whole Law, and yet offend in one point, *viz.* so as wholly to wave it, and to have no respect unto it, he were guilty of all, his Obedience were indeed none at all. For to obey, is to do that which is commanded, because it is commanded. Now he that doth any one thing *eo nomine* because it is commanded, will indeavour to do every thing that is commanded. *A Quatenus ad omne*, &c. That this is the meaning of the words, is clear by *v.* 11. See *Calvin* on the place. Ad 4. The Law doth pronounce an imperfect Obeyer imperfectly righteous; and therefore if he be left to the Law, to stand or fall by it, he shall not be justified for his Righteousness, but shall be condemned for his Imperfection. Ad 5. The Damned and Devils cannot be pronounced Righteous according to the Law, as the Saints may. Is there no difference betwixt Imperfect Obedience, and Perfect (if it may be called Perfect) Disobedience? The Unregenerate do something that, but nothing as the Law requireth: the Regenerate do something both that, and as, though not so perfectly as the Law requireth. *Licet modus agendi* (*inquit* Daven.) *bonus sit, quia agunt ex fide & charitate, tamen gradus in hoc modo deficit, quia non agunt ex tantâ fide & charitate quanta ab ipsâ Lege præcipitur.* It is granted, That the best action of any upon earth is not good and just according to the rigour of the Law; for the rigour of the Law requires it to be perfectly good and just, which it is not. But it follows not, that therefore it is not good and just at all. *Nam aliud est* (saith the same learned Author) *actionem esse verè bonam, aliud esse purè bonam, & ab omni vitio liberam: sicut aliud est aurum verum, aliud aurum purum, ab omni fœce depuratum.* That Rule therefore, *Bonum non nisi ex integrâ causâ oritur, malum ex quolibet defectu*, must be taken *cum grano salis, viz.* so as that the *Defectus* must be either in the substance of the Act, or in some material Circumstance: And of such Actions Dr. *Twisse* (whom you cite) doth speak; *Qui dat eleemosynam vanæ gloriæ studio*, &c. There is indeed some defect in the best Actions of the best Men, *quoad gradum*: But shall we therefore deny them to be good, because they are some way defective, and so not perfectly good? And see here I pray, to what you have now brought the matter; even to make Imperfect Holiness

De Just. Act. c. 34. *Memb.* 2.

Ibid. Cap. 36. *ad fest.* 7.

Holineſs no Holineſs, as well as Imperfect Righteouſneſs no Righteouſneſs. For is not Holineſs Goodneſs as well as Righteouſneſs? Therefore if every defect make Goodneſs no Goodneſs, then there is no more an Imperfect Holineſs (which yet you grant) then there is an Imperfect Righteouſneſs. Thoſe words, [*Neque putandum eſt, fieri poſſe, ut per Legem ſaltem aliquâ ex parte juſtificemur*] taken in *rigore* are not true. For then there were no ſuch thing as a particular Juſtification; neither do they accord with that which I cited before out of *Lud. de Dieu* on *Rom.* 8. 4. to which place you did refer me. Indeed we cannot be ſo juſtified by the Law, as thereby to be freed from all condemnation; and this ſeems to be all that your Author here cited did mean, when he ſaith, *Si non es Legem tranſgreſſus, Lege juſtificaris: ſi tranſgreſſus es, condemnaris.* But this doth no more prove, That Righteouſneſs muſt either be perfect, or it is none at all, (though indeed it is none as to abſolute and univerſal Juſtification) than it doth prove, that there is no Holineſs at all, except it be perfect. For doth not the Law require perfect Holineſs as well as perfect Righteouſneſs? And is not every tranſgreſſion of the Law a privation of Holineſs, as well as of Righteouſneſs? How then can you admit an Imperfect Holineſs to be Holineſs, and yet deny an Imperfect Righteouſneſs to be Righteouſneſs? And if our Inherent Righteouſneſs (for of that we ſpeak) muſt needs be perfect, if it be any at all, muſt not the ſame be ſaid of our Holineſs, this being a conformity to the Law as well as the other?

1. You do not anſwer my Queſtion, *viz.* Whether thoſe Orthodox Writers (a multitude of whom you ſay you could heap up) do make our Perſonal Righteouſneſs that by which we are juſtified. If they do not, their calling it Evangelical is to no purpoſe. 2. It is not prepoſterous to ſay, That Righteouſneſs (*viz.* inherent) is required unto Sanctification; it being that whereby we are ſanctified, as Imputed Righteouſneſs is that whereby we are juſtified. You ſaid before, That I did ill oppoſe that whereby we are juſtified, as if the ſame thing might not do both: You grant then (it ſeems) that Righteouſneſs may ſanctifie; I think it muſt, and ſo is required unto Sanctification. How you can make Inherent Righteouſneſs *ita ſe habere ad ſanctificationem, ut ſe habet* 34.

Albedo

Albedo ad Parietem, to me seems very strange: rather (I think) *ut se habet Albedo ad Dealbationem*. 3. If you had spoken absolutely without any qualification, [*He that affirmeth a Man Righteous*, (viz. *by Inherent Righteousness*) *and yet denieth him to be justified*, viz. *by that Righteousness, contradicteth himself*] you had condemned all our famous Divines (I think) of self-contradiction. But your speech being so qualified, as it is, [*so far as he is Righteous*] I know not at whom it striketh. But though none by the Law of Works can be pronounced perfectly righteous, and therefore if they be tryed by it, all will be found unrighteous, yet doth it not therefore follow, that there is no such thing as an Imperfect Righteousness.

Ibid. You seem not to dislike what I say, neither do I what you now say. I grant, that the New Covenant is to the wicked an unspeakable mercy, in that by it they may be freed from the condemnation of the Old Covenant: yet until they embrace the New Covenant, they remain under the Old, even under the condemnation of it.

35. 1. Concerning Christ's Satisfaction, how it may be called both our Legal and our Evangelical Righteousness, I have spoken before. Legal Righteousness may either signifie the Righteousness of the Law, τῦ νόμε, or the Righteousness which is of or from the Law, ἐκ τῦ νόμε. There is great difference between these two, for the former is asserted, but the latter is exploded, *Rom.* 8. 4. & 10. 5. *Phil.* 3. 9. Christ's Satisfaction may be called our Legal Righteousness in the former sense, not the latter. But in both respects it is our Evangelical Righteousness, as being the Righteousness of the Gospel, τῦ εὐαγγελίε, *i. e.* the Righteousness which the Gospel doth hold out unto us, and the Righteousness which is of or from the Gospel, ἐκ τῦ εὐαγγελίε, *i. e.* the Righteousness which by the Gospel we are made partakers of through Faith. And therefore it is called the Righteousness which is of Faith, ἐκ πίστεως, and by Faith, διὰ πίστεως, *Rom.* 9. 30. & 10. 6. *Phil.* 3. 9. 2. In that Faith is the Condition, or Instrument (or what any please to call it) whereby Christ's Righteousness is made ours unto Justification, it rather follows, that Faith it self is not properly our Righteousness, by which we are justified.

Some-

Something out of *Rivet* I have cited before to this purpose; hear also what another saith, *viz. Vignerius*, whose Disputation *Rivet* much commends, and thought meet to annex it to his own, *Quidni in fide nostrâ gloriabimur, si ex fide justificatio est, ut operæ Evangelico, & apposità fœderi conditione, contra Apostolum, qui exclusam esse dicit per Legem fidei gloriationem?* Rom. 3. 26. --- *An possibile est, ut sit fidei instrumentum accipiendæ justitiæ, & simul sit ipsa, quam querimus, justitia? Utut sanè glorietur homo, solus tamen Christus est nostra justitia, nec aliud agit Fides, quam quòd Christum apprehendit, & nostram facit illius justitiam, ut in eo inveniamur, non nostram habentes justitiam, quæ ex Lege est, sed illam, quæ est per fidem Christi, justitiam, quæ est ex Deo per fidem*, Phil. 3. 9. *De Satisfact. Christi inter opera* Rivet, *Disp.* 13 §. 61.

1. I see nothing in the place cited (*viz. Aphor.* p. 127, 128.) but a Similitude, which proves nothing; and I gave some touch of it in the *Animadversions*. Whereas you now say, [*In respect of the condition of our personal performance to make Christ's Satisfaction ours, Faith is imputed unto us instead of our personal performance of Perfect Obedience*], it seems to imply as if personal performance of Perfect Obedience might be required as a Condition to make Christ's Satisfaction ours, which were very strange. For if Perfect Obedience could be performed by us, what need were there of Christ's Satisfaction to be imputed to us, except for sin committed or contracted before this personal performance of perfect Obedience? *If Righteousness come by the Law, Christ died in vain*, Gal. 2. *ult.* But how-ever, such Obedience cannot be performed by any, there being *not a Just man upon Earth, that doth good, and sinneth not*, Eccles. 7. 20. That Faith is as effectual or sufficient a Condition under the New Covenant, as perfect personal Obedience, if performed, would have been under the Old Covenant: if this were all that you meant, though I like not your expression, yet I allow the thing; only this I think meet to observe, That perfect personal Obedience was so the Condition of the Old Covenant, that it was also the Righteousness required in it: But Faith is so the Condition of the New Covenant, as that it is not properly the Righteousness it self, but only a means to partake of Christ's Satisfaction, which is the Righteousness that the *Ibid.*

New Covenant doth offer and afford to a Believer, instead of Perfect Obedience personally to be performed by the Old Covenant. For that which you add about the paying of a Pepper-Corn, &c. I do not think that we can be said truly and properly to pay any thing our selves as a price, whereby to purchase the benefits of the New Covenant; see *Isa.* 55. 1. and *Apoc.* 22. 17. When we preach and press Holiness and Good Works, we use to distinguish betwixt *Via Regni & Causa regnandi*; and we make them requisite unto Glorification, but not unto Justification. *Dicimus* (*inquit* Rivetus) *bona opera necessaria esse, tanquam adjunctum consequens justificationem, tanquam effectum acquisita salutis, quatenus salus accipitur pro justificatione; & tanquam antecedens ad salutem, quatenus accipitur pro glorificatione; non autem tanquam causam, quæ salutem efficiat.*

Colleg. Contro er. Disp. 36.

2. The acceptance of a Gift, being a means to enjoy it, is a means whereby the Gift doth inrich; and so Faith is a means whereby Christ's Righteousness doth justifie us, as being a means whereby it is imputed unto us, and made ours. But properly it is the Gift that doth inrich, though not without the acceptance of it; and so it is the Righteousness of Christ that doth justifie, though not without Faith. The Tryal of a Man's Title in Law to a Gift, depends on the Tryal, and Proof of his Acceptance of it, because otherwise except he accept of the Gift, it is none of his: Yet for all this, it is the Gift that doth inrich, though it must be accepted, that it may do it. And so it is Christ's Righteousness that we are justified by, though Faith be required of us, that it may be made ours, and so we may be justified by it.

36. That my words are contradictory one to another, you say, but the Reason which you add for proof of it, is of little force. I deny it to be as proper to say, [*We are justified by Faith as a Condition*] as to say, [*We are justified by Christ's Satisfaction, as the Meritorious Cause*]; yea and as the Righteousness by which we are justified. What inconvenience doth arise from it, if *Paul* and the Scriptures do oftner speak improperly than properly in this Point? May not improper Speeches, concerning some Point, be more frequent in Scripture, than proper? Sacramental Speeches, wherein the Sign is called by the name of the Thing signified, are improper: Yet are they more

more frequent in Scripture, than those which in that kind are more proper.

1. You not clearing the Question, either there or any where else (that I know) in your *Aphorisms*, seemed to leave it doubtful; and so I thought meet to note it, that you might prevent any ones stumbling at it. *Ibid.*

2. What you now add upon review, doth less please; For the Holiness that is in us, is from God, the imperfection of it is from our selves; this therefore may be sinful, though God's Work be good.

1. Relation when it is founded in Quality, may (for any thing I see) be intended and remitted, as the Quality is wherein it is founded. I like not *Scheiblers* joyning Similitude and Equality together, as if there were the same reason of both. One thing cannot be more or less equal, though it may be nearer to, or further from Equality than another; but one thing may be more or less like, when yet there is a true and proper likeness in both. *Ibid.* *Vide Alsted. Metaphys.* lib. 2. c. 5.

2. That no Man ever performeth one act fully and exactly conform to the Law of Works, is the same that I say: But why do you put in these terms [*fully and exactly*] if there can be no conformity but that which is full and exact?

3. That our Inherent Righteousness (for I must still mind you that we are speaking of it) is *Non-reatus pœnæ*, I deny; and all that you add there in that Page is impertinent, as being nothing to Inherent Righteousness, about which now is all the Dispute. *Pag.* 37. You seem to come up to what I say, when you grant, that our Gospel-Righteousness considered *in esse officii*, as related to, or measured by the Precept, so our Faith and Holiness admit of degrees. Here by Faith and Holiness, you mean the same with that which immediately before you called Gospel-Righteousness, which must needs be meant of Inherent Righteousness. As for those words which you insert, [and that only *quoad materiam præceptam*] I know not well what they mean. For how can *officium*, as related to, and measured by the Precept, be considered but *quoad materiam præceptam?*

1. If I take Holiness (as you say) as opposite to Sin, How do I make all the Actions of the Heathens Holy? Do I make them not sinful? I have ever approved of those Sayings of the Ancients. 37.

Prosp. *de Vocat. Gent.* lib. 1. cap. 7. *Idem in Sentent. ex* Aug. *Sent.* 106. Aug. *contra* Julian. lib. 4. c. 3.

Sine cultu veri Dei, etiam quod virtus videtur esse, peccatum est. And, *Omnis infidelium vita, peccatum est, & nihil est bonum sine summo bono. Ubi enim deest agnitio æternæ & incommutabilis veritatis, falsa virtus est, etiam in optimis moribus.* And, *Quicquid boni fit ab homine, & non propter hoc fit, propter quod fieri debere vera sapientia præcipit, & se officio videatur bonum, ipso non recto fine peccatum est.* Scripture also doth carry me that way, namely these places, *Rom.* 8. 8, 9. and *Heb.* 11. 6. I wave that place *Rom.* 14. *ult.* because it seems to look another way; though *Prosper de Vitâ Contempl. lib.* 3. *cap.* 1. doth urge it to this purpose. There is not then the same reason of the Actions of Heathens, as of the Actions of Believers: these are imperfectly holy, the other are altogether unholy.

2. You grant that Holiness is the same with Righteousness, which is opposed to *Reatus Culpæ:* And truly I should think, that Inherent Righteousness is rather *Non-reatus Culpæ*, than *Non-reatus Pœnæ.* For your Parenthesis, [*If any were found, that had any such Righteousness according to the Law of Works*] it is ever granted, That such a perfect Righteousness is not found in any upon Earth; but still it is denyed, that because it is not perfect, therefore it is none at all.

Ad Ctesiphont. *contra* Pelagian.

Justi appellantur (saith *Hierom*, speaking of *Zachary, Elizabeth, Job*, &c.) *non quòd omni vitio careant, sed quòd majori parte virtutum commendentur.* You grant, that Holiness may be denominated from its congruency to the Precept as a Precept. Now this you must grant, may *recipere magis & minus:* for so you grant that Holiness may. And if Congruency, why not Conformity? For Congruency and Conformity, though divers words, yet import (for any thing I see) one and the same thing. I take Faith to be in part our Inherent Righteousness, as it is *Officium*, not as it is *Conditio præcisè considerata.*

3. Whether Habitual Faith, or Actual, be properly the Condition of the Covenant, is little to our purpose. And for the thing it self, as I shall grant, that we must not content our selves with a habit of Faith, but must also act Faith: So (I think) you will not deny, that we are *Fideles*, and so justified, even when we sleep, though no act of Faith be performed by us.

You

You say nothing to that which I answered concerning our Divines, of whom you spake, *viz.* That they hold, That the Righteousness whereby we are justified, is not our Personal Righteousness; and therefore though they say, (as you alledge) That our Justification is perfect, and therefore (as you infer) our Righteousness, *viz.* whereby we are justified, must be perfect also; yet all this is little to your purpose. *Ibid.*

2. To what you say, I have said enough before, *viz.* That Faith which is the Condition of the New Covenant, as to Justification, is not our Righteousness whereby we are justified, but only a means to partake of Christ's Satisfaction, the only Righteousness by which we are justified. And for being *rei pœna Novæ Legis* for non-performance of its Condition; I say still, I know no punishment of the New Law for want of Faith as its Condition, but only a leaving to the punishment of the Old Law; which punishment yet (I grant) will be so much the more grievous, as the sin, which an Unbeliever, both as an Unbeliever, and otherwise, is guilty of by Gospel-Aggravations, is the more hainous.

1. I as little doubt but that sincerity of Righteousness doth consist with imperfection of Righteousness, *viz.* Inherent Righteousness, which is really the same with Holiness, how-ever in this or that respect we may distinguish the one from the other. 38.

2. How Hypocrisie can be taken for a seeming or appearing better than we are, yet without affectation or dissimulation, I do not understand. If without any affectation or dissimulation of ours, we seem better than we are, it is another's errour, not our fault; neither can we therefore be called Hypocrites. Your manifold distinctions of Sincerity do serve rather to confound the Reader, than to unfold the matter. I take sincerity to be no distinct Grace, but the *Modus* of other Graces: but why that *Modus* may not admit of degrees, I confess I do not see. I conceive Zeal to be of like nature, yet one may be more or less zealous, and so also more or less sincere. You say here, [There is no *Medium inter Ens & non Ens*] of which I make no doubt but *pag.* 2. you think Relations to be *inter Ens & Nihil*; and what difference between *Nihil & non Ens?* You say, That you have over and over shewed, That Confor-

mity to the Rule of the Condition, doth consist in *indivisibili*. Indeed you have divers times affirmed, That all Conformity is of that nature, but I could never yet see it proved. But why do you now speak of Conformity to the Rule of the Condition? I take Conformity to the Rule of the Precept to be our Personal Righteousness, and the Sincerity of that Conformity to be the Sincerity of this Righteousness. And this Righteousness, though it be sincere, I hold to be imperfect, because the Conformity to the Rule is imperfect. [*Sincerity* (saith Master *Blake*) *is said to be the New Rule, or the Rule of the New Covenant. But this is no Rule, but our Duty, taking the Abstract for the Concrete; Sincerity for sincere walking, and this according to the Rule of the Law, not to reach it, but in all parts to aim at it, and have respect unto it.* Then shall I not be ashamed, when I have respect to all thy Commandments, *Psal.* 119. 6. *And this is our Inherent Righteousness, which in reference to its Rule* (*N. B.*) *labours under many imperfections*]. And a little before he saith thus, [*I know no other Rule but the Old Rule, the Rule of the Moral Law: that is with me a Rule, a perfect Rule, the only Rule*].

Of the Coven. *chap.* 16. *pag.* 111.

3. It seems very incongruous to grant, that *Apoc.* 22. 11. [*Be holy still*] doth import an encrease of Holiness; and yet to deny, that [*Be righteous still*] doth import an increase of Righteousness. For any thing I know, some on the contrary may as well say, That the latter words import an increase of Righteousness, and yet the other no increase of Holiness. Whereas you speak of varying the sense according to the variety of Subjects, you take it for granted, That here the Subjects are various; whereas both by this, and divers other places before cited, it seems clear to me, that the Subjects, *viz.* Righteousness and Holiness are really the same one with the other. For the *Formale* of Righteousness, what is it but Conformity to the Law, the only Rule of Righteousness? And why such Conformity may not be more or less, I am yet to learn. That place indeed, as many other, speaks of a true Personal Righteousness in the Saints, but yet not of a Perfect Righteousness in them; and consequently not of such a Righteousness, as whereby they are justified, except it be only in some sort, and in some

some measure, which is not the Justification about which we contend. This Imperfect Righteousness is measured by the Law of Works, as a Rule, though it be accepted only by the gracious condescension of the Gospel.

To *Ephes.* 4. 24. you give many Answers, but they seem but so many Evasions. 39.

1. I think there is no Question, but the Apostle speaks by way of Precept and Exhortation. *q. d.* If you have indeed learned Christ, and have been taught by him, you have learned to do so and so; therefore have a care to do so. Surely the Apostles words import a duty required, and so implicitly contain a Precept or Exhortation.

2. That he speaks as well to Believers, True Believers, as mere Professors, is as little to be doubted. For he speaks unto them upon a supposition, that they had learned Christ, and had been taught by him; which though it may belong to mere Professors, yet to true Believers much rather.

3. If the New Man, which is created in Righteousness and Holiness, may encrease, as you grant, then surely Righteousness and Holiness, in which the New Man is created, and without which the New Man is nothing, must increase also. To say, That the New Man may increase in Holiness, but not in Righteousness, is for one that would say any thing, so that he may but λέγειν τῇ ὑποθέσει. As well might it be said, That the New Man is created in Holiness, but not in Righteousness.

4. The Form of Righteousness is Conformity to the Law, to which we must labour to conform still more and more, not only *extensivè*, but also *intensivè*.

5. The very conjunction of the words here, as in other places, shews that they are used as ἰσοδυναμοῦντα. Besides, how we should give unto God the things that are God's, and to Men the things that are Mens, and not conform to the Law, which doth prescribe our Duty towards God, and towards Men, I cannot see: and surely Conformity to the Law, is the Righteousness now in question.

1. If we be justified from the Accusation of *Reatus pœnæ primæ Legis propter peccatum*; What need is there of any other justification? [*Upon the Laws Convictions* (saith Mr. *Blake*) *there may follow Gospel-Aggravations; but Conviction is the Work of the Law*]. If *Ibid.* Of the Coven. *c.* 14. *p.* 95.

Conviction, then surely Condemnation. If the Law do not condemn, what can? And what can the Law condemn for, but for sin? It is the Law which is the Ministration of Condemnation, 2 *Cor.* 3. 9. *By the Law is the knowledg of sin*, Rom. 3. 20.

2. For the accusation of *Reatus pœnæ Novæ Legis ob non præstitam Conditionem*, it is no new Accusation, but a making good of a former Accusation; and so *Reatus pœnæ Novæ Legis*, is but to be left *in reatu pœnæ Veteris Legis*; save that *aggravatâ ex Evangelio culpâ ipsa etiam pœna aggravatur.*

3. I confess, I was not before acquainted with these two Justifications which you speak of: I did not find them in your *Aphorisms*, but only two sorts of Righteousness as requisite to one and the same Justification, so I understood it. But truly now that you lay open your conception more than before, I can see no solidity in it. We are justified by the Righteousness of Christ participated by Faith; but not by Faith, as being it self our Righteousness. Faith is indeed required unto Justification, yet not as our Righteousness, but as a Condition, Instrument, or Means (for I would not strive about words) whereby we partake of Christ's Righteousness. I see not, that the Scripture doth speak of such a Two-fold Justification, one by Christ and his Righteousness, another by Faith as our Righteousness; but only of one Justification of Christ through Faith. *By him all that believe are justified*, Acts 13. 39.

Ibid. *Non-reatus pœnæ* is not Inherent Righteousness, of which I expresly spake. I take it to be really the same (*p.* 47.) with Holiness. What you cite therefore out of *Gataker* and *Placæus*, is nothing against me, I speaking of Righteousness in one sense, and they in another. Besides, you seem to mistake the meaning of Mr. *Gataker*'s words: for *Sons* is as much as *reus culpæ*, and *insons* as much as *non-reus culpæ*; whereas you seem to take *Sons* for *Reus pœnæ*, and *Insons* for *Non-reus pœnæ*; how-ever his words are not to our purpose.

Ibid. 1. I see not how either here or elsewhere you infringe that, which I said about the Materiality and Formality, as well of Holiness as of Righteousness.

2. As Holiness (you grant) is a Conformity to the Law, as it doth *constituere debitum officii*, so I conceive

is

is Righteousness, (Inherent I still mean) and not a Conformity to the Rule, as it constituteth, *Conditionem præmii obtinendi, & pœnæ vitandæ, si nimirum secluſâ omni conſideratione officii, Conditio tantùm ut Conditio conſideretur.* (p. 48.)

1. Acceptance as taken for Accepting * as Righteous, or Accounting just, is (I think) as much as Justifying. *Ibid.* & 40.

2. I did not (nor I suppose those other Divines by you mentioned) speak so generally, but to presuppose Faith, whereby our Persons are accepted in Christ, and then our Actions. *By Faith* Abel *offered a more excellent Sacrifice*, &c. *Heb.* 11. 4. At length, after many words, which touch not me, in your *6th*, you grant as much as I did, or do desire, *viz.* That *our Persons must be justified and reconciled, before our external Obedience can be accepted.* Whereas you there add, That *it was not as they were an imperfect Conformity to the Law of Works, that* Abel's *Works were accepted:* I answer, It was not indeed by the Law of Works; yet as they were a sincere, though imperfect Conformity to that Law, as a Rule, so they were accepted by the New Covenant. The Law of Works directs, the Covenant of Grace accepts, though we come short of what the Law requires.

* *Justification is by the consent of all men* (*I mean Protestants*) *a remission of our sins, and accepting of us as Righteous*, Mr. *Kendal against* Mr. Goodwin, *cap.* 4. *p.* 138.

[*The Law* (as Mr. *Blake* saith) *still commands us, though the Covenant in Christ, through the abundant Grace of it, upon the terms that it requires and accepts, frees us from the Sentence of it*]. And again, [*A perfection of Sufficiency to attain the end I willingly grant, God condescending through rich Grace to crown weak Obedience: In this sence our Imperfection hath its perfectness; otherwise I must say, That our Inherent Righteousness is an Imperfect Righteousness, in an imperfect Conformity to the Rule of Righteousness*, &c.] He means the Law of Works, which (as before noted) he saith is, *a Rule, a perfect Rule, the only Rule.* Of the Coven. *ch.* 16. *p.* 9, 10. *Ibid. p.* 111, 112.

1. I shall not deny, but that our Faith and Obedience may be said to be justified from the accusation of unsoundness: Yet I think, That this is but a making good of our Justification against the Accusation of being Sinners. For besides that the unsoundness of Faith (and so 40, & 41.

of

of Obedience) is sin; besides this (I say) if our Faith be not sound, it is in vain, we are yet in our sins, we lie under the Curse and Condemnation of the Law, there being no freedom for us without Faith.

2. I know none that say, Our Actions are justified through Christ's Merit by the Law of Works. For my part I should say, We and our Actions are justified from the Law of Works, *i. e.* from the condemnation of it, God for Christ's sake accepting us and our Actions, notwithstanding our imperfection, for which the Law, if we should be sentenced by it, would condemn us. But here by the way, let me observe this, That your retractation of what you said in your *Aphorisms*, doth seem to manifest thus much, That when you composed those *Aphorisms*, you either knew not, or liked not that Twofold Justification, which now you so often speak of, and somewhere say, That my ignorance in this Point is it, that doth mainly darken all my Discourse. That common saying is not always true, Δεινὸν ἐχει φρονίδος φρονιμάτερα.

For my words; 1. I see not why those, [*Acquitting us from all sin*] should offend you. For you might see by what I there said, That I meant the not-imputing of any sin unto us. And so the Phrases used in Scripture, of God, *not remembring our sins, his covering them, casting them behind his back, into the bottom of the Sea*, &c. they all import such an acquitting of us from sin, as I intended; not as if God did account us to be without sin, which were false, but that God doth not charge sin upon us, *viz.* so as to exact satisfaction for sin from us. I meant the very same with Mr. *Gataker* in the words which you cited *p.* 30. *Non hoc dicitur, Deum apud se judicare, illos pro quorum peccatis universis Christus satisfecit, nihil mali unquam commisisse, aut boni debiti omisisse; sed eodem habere loco quoad mortis reatum, & jus ad vitam æternam, ac si nihil vel mali admisissent, vel boni debiti omisissent.* Thus Christ speaks to the Church, *Cant.* 4. 7. *Thou art all fair, my Love, and there is no spot in thee.* What? may some say, Is there no spot in the Church? No, none in her, so as to be imputed to her. *Sine maculâ deputatur, quia culpa non imputatur*, as one doth no less truly than elegantly express it. You your self yeeld as much as I desire, or as my words import, *viz.* That God acquitteth

Gilber. ad Loc.

quitteth us from all sin, so as it induceth an obligation to punishment.

2. When you say, That to acquit us from the Obligation of the Old Law, is one Justification, and to justifie us against the accusation of being so obliged, is another Justification; I confess (*Davus sum, non Oedipus*) I do not well understand what you mean, for to my apprehension these are one and the same. Me-thinks it must needs be, That what doth acquit us from the Obligation of the Old Law, doth also *eo nomine* justifie us against the Accusation of being so obliged. For how are we acquitted from the Obligation, if not justified against the Accusation of being obliged?

3. I marvel why you should trouble your self with speaking of the sin against the Holy Ghost, and of final unbelief, when as you could not but know, that I spake of all sin, from which we may be justified. Why might not one as well quarrel with those words of the Apostle, Acts 13. 39. *By him all that believe are justified from all things*, &c.

4. I grant the New Covenant not to be violated but by final unbelief, yet (as I expresly added in that very place which you take hold on) so that this be rightly understood. For the right understanding of it, I said something before; and for further explication, I refer you to Mr. *Blake* of the Covenant, *Chap.* 33.

5. But in the next you do most strangely, even without any cause that I can see, παροξυνειν, and (as they say) *fluctus in simpulo excitare*. That [first our Persons, and then our Duties and Actions may properly be said to be justified, that is, accepted as just, and acquitted from all accusation brought against them, though in themselves they be not such, but that sin doth cleave unto them] why should this seem such horrid Doctrine, as that your Heart should detest it?

1. I speak of good Actions: for it is absurd to say, That evil Actions are accepted as just, though we may be so accepted notwithstanding our evil Actions.

2. I plainly say, That sin doth cleave to our good Actions; yet (I say) God doth accept them as just, notwithstanding the imperfection of them, and the sin that doth cleave unto them. If this be offensive to you, as well (I think) may you be offended at that *Nehem.* 13. 22.

13. 22. *Remember me, O Lord, concerning this, and ſpare me according to the greatneſs of thy Mercy.* And ſo at that 1 *Pet.* 2. 5. *You alſo as lively ſtones are built up a Spiritual Houſe, an Holy Prieſthood, to offer up Spiritual Sacrifices, acceptable unto God through Jeſus Chriſt.* Neither is there any reaſon why thoſe words [*acquitted from all accuſation brought againſt them*] ſhould diſtaſte you. For what though an Accuſation be true, if yet in ſome other reſpect it be of no force? May not they be properly ſaid to be acquitted from all Accuſation, who notwithſtanding the Accuſation, are freed from condemnation? What matter is it how we are accuſed, ſo long as we are ſure not to be condemned? Therefore the Apoſtle uſeth theſe Expreſſions as equipollent, [*Who ſhall lay any thing to the charge of God's Elect?*] and [*Who is he that condemneth?*] Rom. 8. 33, 34. Might you not as vehemently fall upon thoſe words of the Apoſtle, [*Who ſhall lay any thing to the charge*, &c.] as you do upon mine? Might you not ſay, Why? I will lay this, and that, and that, and ten thouſand things beſides to their charge? Yea, but when you have done all you can, to what purpoſe is it? *For who is he that condemneth them, notwithſtanding all the Accuſations brought againſt them?* Theſe very words of the Apoſtle doth *Ameſius* alledg in the former of thoſe Sections which you cite. And if (as you ſay) all may be there fully ſeen in *Ameſius*, that you would ſay in this, then I ſee not that you would ſay any thing againſt me, as indeed you do ſay nothing. But what do you mean by thoſe words, [*and that as to the Law of Works*] which by a Parentheſis you thruſt in among mine? As if I meant, that as well our Actions as our Perſons are accepted as juſt, and acquitted from all condemnation by the Law of Works. Truly I think *tàm quàm*, as well the one as the other, that is indeed neither the one nor the other. The Law doth convince of ſin, and (as much as in it lies) condemn for ſin, both us and our Actions, even the beſt of them: But by the New Covenant, Through Faith in Chriſt we are accepted as juſt, though guilty of manifold ſins; and our Actions are accepted alſo, though full of imperfection. When you ſay, That the *Reatus Culpæ* cannot poſſibly be removed, or remitted, though I think it is but a ſtriving about words, which I do not love, yet

Medull. lib. 1. *c.* 27. §. 20.

I cannot assent unto it. For I think it is truly and properly said to be remitted or pardoned; neither doth that seem proper or pertinent, which you add by way of Explication, [that is, *The Man cannot be, or justly esteemed to be a Man that hath not sinned*]. *Quid tum postea?* Cannot therefore the guilt of sin be remitted? Yea, how should sin be remitted, if it were not committed? I think it is as proper to say, *Remittere culpam*, as *Remittere pœnam*. Surely if I may argue from the frequent use of Phrases, and hence infer the propriety of them, as you did, there is nothing more usual in Scripture, (and so in other Writings, and in common Speech) then to say, that Sins, Faults, Offences are remitted. *Grotius* saith, That ἀφιέναι, which in Latin is *Remittere*, is as much as *missum facere*; and that the Greek Scholiasts usually expound it by ἀμελεῖν, *i. e.* to neglect, not to regard, to pass over, (as *Prov.* 19. 11. *to pass over a transgression*) and that therefore ἁμαρτήματα ἀφιέναι, is *peccata missa facere*, which the Scripture (he saith) following the Metaphor further, calls *peccata in mare projicere*, Mich. 7. 19. It is true, Sin is said to be remitted in reference unto Punishment: *Remittere*, or *missa facere peccata*, (as *Grotius* saith) is as much as *punire nolle*. Yet this hinders not but that sin, or the guilt of sin is properly said to be remitted or pardoned; yea (I think) it doth confirm it. For if it be proper to say, That God will not punish sin, and this is as much as to remit or pardon sin; then it is proper to say, That God doth remit or pardon sin. In a word therefore, my words, about which you make so much adoe, are such as that I see not why any should stumble at them. They do not import, that our Actions, even the best of them, if strictly examined, are not sinful; or that God doth not see any sin in them; but only that God doth pardon and pass by the sinfulness of them, and accept them in Christ, (who is the High-Priest, that doth bear, and so take away the Iniquity of our holy things, *Exod.* 28. 38.) as if they had no sin in them. Neither do I see why you should detest this justifying of our Actions, and yet grant the justifying of our Persons. Your Reasons seem to make as much against the one as against the other. For are not our Persons sinful as well as our Actions? Surely if the Action be sinful, the Person whose Action it is

De Satisf. pag. 52.

Ibid. p. 53.

must

must needs be so too. And though you pass over the next, because you reverse your former Assertion, yet in that which I there said, you might have seen enough to vindicate me from all that you have here said against me.

42. 1. You grant what I say.

2. I have said before, That though (in mine Opinion) sin may properly be said to be remitted, yet this is in reference unto punishment.

3. You had no reason to imagine, that I should think, that my Actions, or the Actions of the best upon Earth, can be justified against all Accusations, as if they were absolutely good and perfect; when in that very place I spake of the imperfection and iniquity that is in our best Actions, and how it is through Christ covered, and not imputed unto us. Yea, and immediately I cited divers places of Scripture (*viz. Eccles.* 7. 20. *James* 3. 2. 1 *John* 1. 8, 9. *Job* 9. 4. *Exod.* 28. 38.) to prove, that neither our Persons, nor our Actions are so righteous, but that we may be accused of, and condemned for sin in them, and so without the mercy of God in Christ must be. It is strange how you should pass by all this, it being directly before your eyes, and should raise a suspicion, as if I should mean quite contrary.

Ibid. 1. It will not follow that our Persons being once justified by Christ, afterward they may be justified by our Works, when once our Works themselves are all justified in that sense as I explained it, *viz.* That first it is meant only of good Works; and then that God doth not justifie those good Works for their own sake, as if they were fully and perfectly Righteous, but for Christ's sake pardoning and passing by the imperfection that is in them.

De Just. Act. c. 33. *Memb.* 2. *Illud semper retineatur,* (*inquit* Davenantius) *hanc acceptationem operum pendere ex praevia acceptatione personæ in Christo; Cum enim ipsi renati carnem peccatricem adhuc gestent, & opera illorum omnia carnis vitium redoleant, Deus neque ipsos, neque eorum opera grata haberet, nisi & hos & illa in Christo magis quàm in seipsis amplexaretur.* What you say of *Chamier* and others, as being against the meritoriousness of Works merited by Christ, might well have been spared, as being nothing at all against me, who am far from making our Works meritorious, when I make even the best of them

them imperfect, and to need pardon. 2. It is evident by this very Section, to which you now reply, that I spake only of good Actions. For how absurd and senseless were it to say, that our Sins are not fully and perfectly righteous, as I there say that our Works are not? The two former Sections also clearly shew of what Works I spake; so that here you do but *nodum in scirpo quærere.*

1. Asserting may well enough be called Confessing, though it be that, and somewhat more. *Ibid.* 43, & 44.

2. I cannot tell what Judgment some others may be of, I speak for my self.

3. I take all sin to be against the Law, as it is distinguished from the Gospel, though some sins may be aggravated by the Gospel. Of that Law I suppose St. *John* spake, saying, *Sin is a transgression of the Law*, 1 Joh. 3. 4. And St. *Paul*, *By the Law is the knowledg of sin*, Rom. 3. 20. And again, *I had not known sin but by the Law: for I had not know lust*, (or as the Margent hath it, *concupiscence*, *viz.* to be sin) *except the Law had said*, *Thou shalt not covet*, Rom. 7. 7. I think it is the common judgment of Divines, that every sin is against some of the Ten Commandments.

4. It is no hard matter to conceive how unbelief, and neglect of the Sacraments, &c. are sins against the Precepts of the Decalogue. The first precept requires us to have the Lord, and him only, for our God; and so to believe whatsoever he doth reval unto us, and to perform whatsoever he doth require of us. The second Precept requires us to Worship God as he himself doth prescribe; and consequently not to neglect any of God's Ordinances; See Mr. *Cawdrey* and Mr. *Palmer* of the Sabbath, *Part.* 2. *Chap.* 4. §. 21, 22, 23. What you add after, makes all for me in this particular, only some things seem meet to be observed.

1. This (I confess) to me is strange Philosophy, That the Earth, of which Man's Body was made, ceased not to be Earth still, when it was made Man. As well may you say, That *Adam*'s rib, of which *Eve* was formed, ceased not to be a Rib still; and so that all the Elemenrs retain their several Natures in all mixt Bodies.

2. *The Precept and Threatning* (you say) *are parts of the New Law, though they be common with the Old.*

Here

Here you seem to grant, That nothing is commanded, or threatned in the New Law, which is not commanded or threatned in the Old. Me-thinks then you should not make a Two-fold Righteousness, and a Two-fold Justification: one in respect of the Old Law, another in respect of the New. The Precept [*believe*] belongs to the Old Law; but as it is not only a Precept, but also a Condition, upon performance of which Salvation is promised, [*Believe, and thou shalt be saved*] so it belongs to the New Law. So this Threatning [*If thou dost not believe, thou shalt perish*] belongs to the Old Law, as threatning death for every sin, and consequently for unbelief, which is a sin: and it belongs to the New Law, as leaving an Unbeliever under the condemnation of the Old Law both for that sin of unbelief, and also for all other sins, from the guilt of which he cannot be freed, because he doth not perform the Condition, which the New Law to that end doth require of him. And (as I have before noted) the Condemnation of an Unbeliever is now increased, as his Sin is, by neglecting Salvation offered upon condition of believing.

3. You say, That *the promissory part of the Law of Works doth not oblige*. But your Reason seems invalid, *Quia cessat materia, vel capacitas subjecti*. You mean, no Man can perform the Condition; and so no Man is capable of the Promise made upon that Condition. But why may it not be said, That as the Precept, which is also the Condition, ceaseth not, though none be able to obey it: so the Promise doth remain, though none can enjoy the benefit of it? It may seem unreasonable, that the Threatning should still be in force, and the Promise be quite taken away.

4. You say again, That *the Earth, of which Man's Body was made, doth still retain the form of Earth*; which surely doth need further Explication, or Confirmation, or both.

5. *The threatning of the New Law* (you say) *hath something proper to the New Law*: But for any thing I see, the New Law doth threaten nothing, which the Old Law doth not threaten: though as by the New Law there is an aggravation of sin, so there will be an increase of condemnation.

6. Whereas

6. Whereas you say, that the right stating and clear apprehension of this part, (*viz.* of the difference between the Law and the Gospel, and how far the Law of Works is abrogated) is of greater moment and difficulty by far than my Animadversions take notice of, or than any thing (as to difficulty) that I deal with; truly my desire was, and so is, only to give you some hints for the further clearing of things in the Second Edition of your *Aphorisms*. But if you think, that here in this Section, which is somewhat long, you have sufficiently explicated those Points, I am not of your mind.

1. All that you here say is nothing to my *Animadversion*; only you strive a little about the acceptation of those words [*the Moral Law*]. 44.

2. Neither do I make the Moral Law as taken for the Precept conjunct with the Threatning, a true part of the New Law: yet the Moral Law so taken, being not dissolved or abrogated by the New Law, as you grant, Unbelievers, while they remain such, both for their unbelief, and for their other sins, are under condemnation, as belonging unto them by the Old Law, there being no Remedy provided for them by the New Law; which hath no other threatning, (I think) but that it leaves Unbelievers to the Old Law, and the condemnation of it.

1. I do not dislike your Thesis, [*That Christ died not to satisfie for the violation of the Covenant of Grace*] as you understand it, *viz.* for final unbelief. Yet I hold, That such as profess the Gospel, and live in those sins, which are not consistent with true and sincere Faith, do for the time violate the Covenant of Grace; and for such violation of that Covenant Christ died, or else all such are left without Remedy. I am in this fully of Mr. *Blakes* mind, [*As a wife* (saith he) *by adultery, so they by sin forsake the Covenant, by which they stand betrothed; and by consequence it must needs follow, that Christ died for breach of the Covenant of Grace, as well as for breach of the Covenant of Works; unless we will say, That all Men by name Christians, and found in any of these sins, are in a lost and unrecoverable condition, joyning with those that have said, That there is no Grace or Pardon for those that fall into sin after Baptism. That he died not for their sins, that live and die in final impenitency and unbelief, may be easily granted:* *Ibid.* & 45. Of the Coven. *chap.* 33.

ted: and that rises to no more, than that he died not for those, that finally and unrecoverably break Covenant with him].

2. Whereas you confess, That for unbelief and impenitency, though it be not final, Men remain *obligati ad pœnam per Legem Naturæ*, but deny it as to the proper Obligation of the New Law; I conceive that the New Law providing no Remedy for them, while they remain such; in this respect they are as well by the New Law *obligati ad pœnam* for the time, as final Unbelievers and Impenitents are for ever. You grant the Gospel doth *non-liberare*, while Men continue in Unbelief; yet you conceive, That it doth not *obligare ad pœnam propriè, viz. ad non-liberationem, & ad pœnam majorem*. Now I conceive that while it doth *non-liberare*, it may be said, *obligare ad non-liberationem*; though I should rather like to say, That it doth *relinquere in statu non-liberationis*, and so *majoris pœnæ ob contemptum gratiæ, & misericordiæ oblatæ*. In your Similitude, The Malefactor, whiles he refuses to come in, and submit to the Terms upon which Pardon is offered, remains in a state of Condemnation, though the sentence be not executed upon him, except he continue in his refusal of the offer unto the term prefixed. But you profess your self willing to acknowledg, That this *non-liberatio* may in some sort be called *Pœna*; and truly I think, that *Pœna Nova Legis non alia est, quàm non-liberatio à pœnâ veteris Legis; hoc tamen semper addito, pœnam veteris Legis, ob neglectum liberationis in Lege Novâ oblatæ, graviorem reddi.*

45. I mean [*Actually in the state of Damnation*] and you grant as much as I desire, *viz.* That they are obliged even for that sin unto death, *per Legem Naturæ, & non liberati per Legem Gratiæ*. Why then should you deny, that they are actually obliged to Damnation? Will you put a difference between Death and Damnation? Or betwixt obliged, and actually obliged? *He that believeth not, is condemned already*, John 3 18. therefore he is actually under condemnation, and so remains, as long as he remains in unbelief; *The Wrath of God abideth on him*, John 3. 36. That the Sentence is not yet executed, but upon believing he may be freed from the execution of it, is another thing.

The

The Parentheſis, which you ſay, is wanting in your *Aphoriſms*, might help to make the words more clear; as they ſtand, they ſeem obſcure: which is all that I would have obſerved. *Ibid.*

Neither am I willing to fall upon either Logical or Philoſophical Diſputes; yet I am alſo unwilling to recede from received Opinions, except I ſee urgent cauſe for it. Now that an Accident muſt have a Subject to exiſt in, as it is generally held, ſo I am perſwaded it is true. *Burgerſdicius* (whoſe authority I may well enough oppoſe to *Scheiblers*) ſaith, *Accidens eſt Ens ſubſtantiæ inhærens.* Indeed he ſaith, *Relationes non tam inhærent alicui ſubjecto, quàm adhærent:* but he doth not deny that they do *inhærere.* For he ſaith, *Relatio ejuſmodi accidens eſt, quod non tantùm* (*N. B.*) *in aliquo eſt, ut in ſubjecto, ſed refertur etiam ad aliud.* It is uſually one Argument which our Divines have againſt Tranſubſtantiation, that thereby Accidents are made to exiſt without a Subject. *Scheibler* grants, that an Accident hath not exiſtence by it ſelf, that it is not ἀυθυπόςατον, (ſo it ſhould be, not ἀνθυπόςατον). Now every thing that hath Exiſtence, muſt (I think) either exiſt by it ſelf, or in ſome other thing. *Ibid.* & 46. *Logic.* lib. 1 cap. 7.

2. *Adjunctum & Subjectum*, and *Effectum & Cauſa*, are not ſo contradiſtinct, but that the ſame thing may be *Adjunctum & Effectum*, and ſo the ſame thing *Subjectum & Cauſa.*

3. Whereas *Scheibler* ſaith, *Actio tranſiens nullum habet ſubjectum, ne quidem ipſum Patiens, ut viſum eſt*; I ſay, *Ego illud nondum vidi, nec vel verum, vel verisimile mihi videtur.* I think, *Omnis Actio ſubjectatur in Patiente:* and this I hold to be true even of Immanent Actions, which though they have the Agent for the Subject, yet it is becauſe the Agent is there alſo the Patient; and it is not *quà Agens*, but *quà Patiens*, that it is the ſubject of the Action. See Mr. *Kendal* againſt Mr. *Goodwin*, *chap.* 4. *p.* 135.

4. He argues thus, *Actio ut ſic non dicit niſi egreſſum à virtute activâ alicujus Agentis. Egreſſus autem opponitur ei eſſe in. Reſp.* 1. *Actio ut ſic neceſſario infert Paſſionem. Fieri enim non poteſt, ut aliquid agat, niſi etiam aliquid patiatur. Ergo Actio non tantum dicit egreſſum à virtute activâ, verùm etiam infert receptionem in Patiente.* 2. *Actio & Paſſio ſunt idem*

motus ; sed Actio vocatur quatenus ab Agente procedit, Passio autem quatenus in Patiente recipitur. Etiamsi igitur Actio & Passio formaliter differant, cum tamen realiter idem sint, si Passio est in subjecto, Actionem etiam in subjecto esse necesse est.

5. Whereas you doubt whether *Scotus* be not right in holding that Immanent Acts are in the Predicament of Quality, that (as divers other Passages) doth shew that you are much inclined to that which doth cross the common Opinion ; which surely is in it self very dangerous, though (I know) you are prudent and sober-minded, so that there is little cause of fear this way in respect of you. Yet wanton Wits, and unstable Spirits, may extend your Notions further than you intended them ; and therefore, especially considering the times into which we are faln, you have need to be wary : but *dictum sapienti sat est.*

46. See Mr. *Kendal* against Mr. *Goodwin*, chap. 4. p. 130, 131. *Ibid.*

Though we cannot know God to Perfection, yet we may and must know him so, as to remove from him all Imperfection, and consequently all composition. The more simple any thing is, *cæteris paribus*, the more perfect it is : Therefore God being most Perfect, he is most Simple.

This contains only a Logical Dispute about the Predicaments and Relations. Now for the Predicaments, though I do not say that they all note real Beings distinct one from another, so Action and Passion do not ; yet I think they all note real Beings, *i. e.* Beings which are not meerly rational or imaginary. And how you should question this, especially of Substance, Quantity and Quality, (which are more than two) I cannot conceive. And for Relations, hear *Aquinas*, whose judgment (besides that he giveth reason for what he saith) with me is of far more weight than of your late Authors. *Quidam posuerunt Relationem non esse rem naturæ, sed rationis tantùm. Quod quidem apparet esse falsum ex hoc, quòd ipsæ res naturalem ordinem & habitudinem habent ad invicem.* Yet as there are *Entia Rationis*, so there are *Relationes Rationis*. Yea, *Aquinas* shews, that *Quædam Relationes sunt quantum ad utrumque extremum res naturæ*, &c. *Quandoque verò in uno extremo est res naturæ, & in altero extremo est res rationis tantùm, nempe cum duo extrema non sunt ejusdem ordinis,*

Part. 1. Quest. 13. Art. 7. *in Corp.*

Ibid. Et Vide. ibid. ad 2. & ad 4.

dinis, &c. And of this latter sort he notes the Relations are, which are betwixt God and the Creatures. *Cum igitur (inquit) Deus sit extra totum ordinem creaturæ, & omnes creaturæ ordinentur ad ipsum, & non è converso, manifestum est, quòd creaturæ realiter referuntur ad Deum, sed in Deo non est aliqua realis relatio ad creaturas, sed secundum rationem tantùm, in quantum creaturæ referuntur ad ipsum. Et sic nihil prohibet hujusmodi nomina importantia relationem ad creaturam, prædicari de Deo ex tempore, non propter mutationem aliquam ipsius, sed propter creaturæ mutationem, sicut columna fit dextra animali, nullâ mutatione circa ipsam existente, sed animali translato.* And again, *Creatio (inquit) activè considerata significat actionem divinam, quæ est ejus essentia cum relatione ad creaturam. Sed relatio in Deo ad creaturam non est realis, sed secundum rationem tantùm: relatio verò creaturæ ad Deum est realis*, &c. *Aquin.* Part 1. Quæst. 45. Art. 3. Ad 1.

Heereboord, p. 179. saith, *Pater non significat aliquid, quod humanæ naturæ propriè & per se insit, sed quomodo ille, qui sic dicitur, se habeat ad filium.* Resp. *Pater est Relatum, nempe Substantia cum Relatione ad aliud: Paternitas est Relatio, & inest subjecto, nempe homini, qui est Pater. Quod* p. 184. *dicit Relationem esse medium inter Ens reale & Nihil, id tantum dicit, non probat.*

You say, That however you are confident, that Relation is not *verè Ens*; yet you will not say, that it is *Nihil* or *Non Ens*; and you said before, (as I noted, and it is most sure) *Inter Ens & non Ens non datur medium.* The distinction of *Medium Participationis*, & *Medium Negationis* will not here serve. For certainly *Contradictoria non admittunt medium Negationis. Aut Homo, aut non Homo: aut Ens, aut non Ens: non datur medium.* The Authors to which you refer me, I have not, save only Dr. *Twisse*; but he is of another Edition, *viz.* in *Folio*, so that I cannot find the place, as you cite it.

1. He that is justified, is so freed from all condemnation, that he is liable to no condemnation, *Rom.* 8. 1, 33, 34. And he that is so freed, is perfectly freed, and consequently perfectly justified, though the freedom from condemnation, and so the justification be not so fully and *Ibid.* & 47, 48, 49.

perfectly made manifest as it shall be. The freedom from condemnation *per sententiam Judicis*, of which you speak, doth not add to the freedom it self, but only to the manifestation of it. The Sentence is indeed past already, *John* 3. 18. though it be not so solemnly pronounced, as it shall be.

2. He that is freed from all Condemnation, is certainly freed from all Accusation, so as that no Accusation can be prejudicial to him; though he may be accused, yet it matters not, seeing he cannot be condemned. Else the Apostle had triumphed before the Victory, saying, *Who shall lay any thing to the charge*, &c. *Who is he that condemneth*? Rom. 8. 33, 34.

3. The Apostle doth not only say, *There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus*, Rom. 8. 1. but also, *Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's Elect*? v. 33. *viz.* when they are in Christ, and so justified. Which in effect is as much, as if it were said, There shall be no condemnation to such. But you grant, That other Texts speak as much, and that such neither now are, nor ever shall be under condemnation. Yet you say, That they would be to morrow condemned, if no more were done than is done. You mean (I suppose) if they did not renew the Act of Faith: but (I say, and you grant it) they who are once justified, though they sin daily, yea, and may lie long in sin, as *David* did, yet they shall renew the Act of Faith, and have the joy of God's Salvation restored unto them, as he prayed, *Psal.* 51. 12. Neither is there any intercision of Justification, though there may be a privation of the joy and comfort of it.

To your Objections, I answer, *Ad* 1. He that is once justified, can contract no guilt so as to fall from his Justification. Besides, when I spake of Justification being perfect, I only mean, That a Justified Person is justified, not in part only, but fully, *i. e.* from all sins which at present he is guilty of: not but that his Justification hath need to be renewed in respect of new sins; and so his Justification may be said to increase *extensivè*, as extending to more and more sins, as they are increased more and more. But that in this respect we shall be more fully justified at the last Judgment than we are now, is

but

but by accident, and not from the Nature or Essence of Justification.

Ad 2. Justification *per Sententiam Judicis, & Sententiam magis publicam,* makes (as I said) but for the more full and perfect manifestation of it. *In de judicii* (*inquit* Maccovius) *Christus non tam justificaturus* (*N. B.*) *est credentes, quàm declaraturus est ex operibus eorum, eos credidisse in hâc vitâ, & justificatos fuisse.* Thus undoubtedly is that to be understood in *Acts* 3. 19. For without question no sins shall then (at the last Judgment) be blotted out, which were not blotted out before: but the blotting of them out shall then more fully appear than before. *In resurrectione à mortuis,* (*inquit* Rainoldus *noster*) *Christus, qui veniet judicatum vivos & mortuos, quemadmodum ipse pronunciat, ea quæ ligaverint ipsius ministri, ligatum iri in cœlis, ita quæ prius in terrâ remissa fuerint, confirmabit ipse suâ sententiâ, ut remissa & deleta in æternum, omnia nimirum fidelium & sanctorum peccata. Quare quæcunque, & quorumcunque peccata remissa fuerint in hoc seculo, etiam in futuro seculo remittentur, quoniam autem peccata non fuerint remissa in hoc seculo, non remittentur in futuro, nempe peccata hominum incredulorum & impiorum.* Petrus, Act. 3. *hoc locupletissimè confirmavit.—Resipiscite* (*inquit*) *ut deleantur peccata vestra, postquam venerint tempora refrigerationis, &c.——Nostri cum affirmant peccata non remitti in futuro seculo, sed in isto tantum, negant id quod astruunt Pontificii, peccata remissum iri in futuro seculo, quæ in præsenti non remittebantur. Nam Christus confirmabit sententiam suam, quam prius tulit, cum feret sententiam illam novissimam in ultimo judicio. Itaque peccata nulla tum remittentur, nisi quæ quisque testimonio conscientiæ suæ hîc percipit remissa esse in præsenti seculo.—Certè ipse* (Bellarminus) *agnovit, vel agnoscere potuit è verbis* * Calvini *quæ citat, nos hoc judicio esse, præsertim in eo ipso loco* Calvini *quem citat, ubi ait* Calvinus, *Christum* (Mat. 12. 32.) *hâc partitione usum esse, quâ judicium complexus est, quod sentit in hâc vitâ uniuscujusque conscientia, & postremum illud, quod palam* (*N. B.*) *in resurrectione feretur.* For *peccata futura,* which you also here speak of, I have said enough in answer to the former Objection. And you

De Justif. Disp. 7.

De Libr. Apocryph. Prælect. 171.

* *Instit. lib.* 3. *c.* 1. §. 7.

may see much more to this purpose in the Account given to the Parliament by the Ministers which they sent to *Oxford*, p. 7, 8, 9.

Ad 3. Castigatory Punishment is no part of that Condemnation, from which we are freed by Justification, but a means to preserve us from falling into Condemnation, see 1 *Cor.* 11. 32.

Ad 4. Though the continuance of our Justification here be conditional, *viz.* upon condition of the continuance of our Faith, yet the continuance of the Condition being certain, so also is the continuance of our Justification. There is not the like reason of Predestination, which is only a decreeing of what God will do for us; but God justifieth (as you say) *pro præsenti*; and whom he once justifieth, he will always justifie; else the Apostle would not say, *Whom he justified, them he also glorified*, Rom. 8. 30. Though Means must be used, and Conditions performed for the continuation and consummation of our Justification; yet it being certain that the Means shall be used, and the Conditions performed, it is also certain that our Justification shall be continued and consummated.

Here perhaps you may take hold of what I say, and object, It shall be consummated; therefore as yet it is not consummated.

Answ. It is not (I grant) in respect of the full enjoyment of the Benefits belonging to Justified Persons: but it is already consummated; * so that they have a full right to the enjoyment of those Benefits. Therefore the Apostle speaks as of a thing already done, *Whom he justified, them he also glorified:* see also *Rom.* 5. 1, 2.

* *Justificatio nullum locũ relinquit condemnationi.* Joh. 5. 24. *Et vitam æternam certò & immediatè adjudicat.* Ames. *Medul. lib.* 1. *cap.* 27. §. 23.

Ad 5. If by this, [*the solemnizing of all is wanting*] you mean, That yet there wants the manifestation of our Justification, it hinders not but that our Justification is already perfect, though it be not so perfectly made manifest as hereafter it shall be. So if by [*Marriage not solemnized*] you mean a Marriage not publickly celebrated, I see not but that a Marriage privately celebrated may be in it self as perfect as the other. But it seems strange, that you should think, that we should scarce be called Justifi-

ed

ed now, but in reference to Justification at the last Judgment; when-as both Scripture and Divines usually speak of Justification as a thing that we are here actually partakers of. What you say of Mr. *Lawson*, as if he held, That Justification here is but a right to Justification hereafter, I much wonder at: His Reasons I know not, but if that be his Opinion, the whole current of Scripture, and the general consent of Divines (I think) is against him. Whereas you call the solemn pronouncing of Sentence at the last day, Sentential Justification, I should rather call it, Publick Sentential Justification, or a publick manifestation of the Sentence of Justification. For surely our Justification here is * Sentential, God doth now pronounce and sentence Believers Just and Righteous, though not in that clear and evident manner as he will at the Last Judgment. Neither do I think that our Divines commonly using the word [*Justification*] for Justification (as you say) by Sentence, do understand it of the Sentence at the last Day, but of the Sentence whereby God doth now justifie those that believe.

* See the *Oxford* account, *p.* 7. and *Amesi. Med. lib.* 1. *cap.* 27.

Perhaps you will say, Where is that Sentence?

Answ. It is in the Scripture. But (you may say) The Scripture speaks only in general. Well, but if God in the Scripture say, That *all that believe are justified*, as *Acts* 13. 39. then consequently he saith, That you and I believing, are justified. And this Sentence God by his Spirit doth bring home to Believers in particular; though it is true, they have not that clear evidence and full assurance, as they shall have hereafter. So for Condemnation at the last day, I think it to be but a more solemn and publick pronouncing of the Sentence, together with the immediate and full execution of it. For otherwise the Sentence is past already, *He that believeth not, is condemned already*, John 3. 18. I do not deny, that Declarative Justification at the last Judgment, is properly Justification; only I think it is the same Justification which Believers here have, though it shall then be more fully manifested than now it is. That which you speak of Justification being more full at death than before, only shews that it is more full *Extensivè*, as freeing from the guilt of more sins: but that is only *per accidens*; Justification in it self considered, was as perfect before: for it freed from all sin, and from all Condemnation, and the other doth no more. What

50. What the meaning of your Question was, [*If we be not one real Person with Christ, then one what?*] I could not tell: but the words did seem to imply, That we must either be one real Person with Christ, or else we could not any way be one with him; whereas the Scripture is clear, that Believers are one with Christ, though that they are one real Person with him, is not to be admitted. Therefore I thought meet to answer as I did, *viz.* That we are *one Spirit*, as the Apostle expresseth it, 1 *Cor.* 6. 17. that is, spiritually one with Christ, as being partakers of one and the same Spirit with him. No doubt but further Queries may still be made: and who is able to clear all Difficulties that do occur in matters of this nature? Yet I see not why we should not content our selves with those Similitudes and Resemblances, which the Scripture doth use to illustrate this Mystery, as of the *Vine* and *Branches*, Joh. 15. and of the *Head* and *Members*, Ephes. 5.

Ibid. To your next Section I need say no more than this, *Non oportet litigare de verbis, cum de re constet.*

Ibid. & 51. I have shewed my meaning all along, *viz.* That Christ's Satisfaction, and not Faith, is properly that by which we are justified. Whereas you say, [*We are justified by Faith it self, as the Condition, and not so by Christ*] I can admit it only thus, That Faith is the Condition required of us, that so we may be justified by Christ. Otherwise I cannot yeeld, that the performing of the Condition required of us unto Justification, is properly that by which we are justified; but of that enough before. For the Habit and Act of Faith, I little doubt but that Habits and Acts are of a different nature. For Habits may be in us when we sleep, or otherwise do not act and exercise those Habits. I think also, that though acquired Habits follow Acts, yet infused Habits (such as Faith is) go before.

2. The Act of Faith being the receiving of Christ, I see not how any can make the Act of Faith, but the Habit to be the Instrument of receiving Christ. And if any of our Divines say, That it is not the Habit of Faith, but the Act that doth justifie; I think they mean, that Faith doth justifie as acting, *i.e.* receiving Christ. So that they do not deny the Habit of Faith to justifie, yea, they make it the instrumental cause of Justification; only they make

make the Act of Faith requisite unto Justification. The Similitude betwixt the Hand and Faith is to the purpose, though they differ as you say. No Similitude is to be set on the Rack: if it seem to illustrate that for which it is used, it is sufficient. But except you speak of the supernatural perfection of the Soul, I see not how Faith is the perfection of it. For the Soul hath its natural perfection without Faith, or any other Habit. Whereas you labour much to prove, that the Habit of Faith is not properly an Instrument, I think you trouble your self to no purpose, though (I know) you have some end in it. But what if it be not an Instrument properly, if yet it may not unfitly be so termed? And for any thing I see, it may, even as generally Divines do so term it.

Fides (saith *Rivet*) *est velut organum; & manus animæ, quâ beneficia oblata acceptantur.* And again, *Videndum est quodnam sit animæ organum hanc remissionem apprehendens — Id fidei exclusivè tribuendum*, &c. *Disp. de Fide Just.* §. 17, 18.

So *Trelcatius Jun. Ex parte hominis, Justificationis passiva causa efficiens est ac dicitur reductivè, tota est Instrumentalis, & Fides est*, &c. *Instit. lib. 2. de Justif.*

Thus also *Calvin, Fides Instrumentum est duntaxat percipiendæ justitiæ.* Inst. *lib.* 3. *cap.* 11. §. 7.

And *Wotton, Ex efficientibus Justificationis causis reliqua est Fides, quam Instrumenti locum obtinere diximus.* And again, *Nec illud quidem cujusquam est momenti, quod Instrumenti nomine nusquam in Scripturis* (*Fides*) *insigniatur. Nam nec Causa esse dicitur, cujus tamen rationem obtinere, Theologi omnes confitentur.* *De Recon.* p. 1. l. 2. c. 18 *Ibid.* p. 2. l. 2. c. 6.

And *Bellarmine* saying, that *Luther* makes Faith *Formalem causam Justificationis*; *Davenant* answers, *Instrumentalem semper agnoscit, non autem formalem*, &c. *De Just. Habit.* cap. 22.

Pemble saith, [*Faith doth justifie Relatively and Instrumentally*]. Of Justif. §. 2 *chap.* 1. *p.* 27.

So Mr. *Ball* of Faith, *chap.* 10. *pag.* 135. [*It is a cause only Instrumental*, &c.]

And of the Covenant, *chap.* 3. *p.* 19. [*Faith is a necessary and lively Instrument of Justification*, &c. *If it be demanded whose Instrument it is? It is the Instrument of the Soul*, &c.] See *Hemingius* as here cited, *p.* 95.

Mr.

Of the Coven. c. 12. p. 80. Mr. *Blake's* words (I think) do more nearly concern you. [*And these things considered, I am truly sorry, that Faith should now be denied to have the office and place of an Instrument in our Justification; nay, scarce be allowed to be called the Instrument of receiving Christ that justifies us*, &c.] And having cited *Acts* 18. 26. *Ibid.* pag. 81. *Ephes.* 3. 17. & *Gal.* 3. 14. he saith, [*These Scriptures speak of Faith as the Souls Instrument to receive Christ Jesus*, &c.] See there much more to this purpose.

Of Justif. c. 7. p. 90. I will add to these one more, *viz. J. Goodwin*, who though in divers things he be cross and contrary to our Divines, yet in this, at least in words, he doth comply with them, professing to hold, That *Faith doth justifie instrumentally.*

If the propriety of Words must always be strictly examined, we shall scarce know how to speak: It is well if we can find words, whereby to express our selves so as that others may understand (if they please) what we mean. All that our Divines mean, when they speak of Faith justifying Instrumentally, or as an Instrument, I suppose, is this, and so much also they usually express, That Faith doth not justifie absolutely, or in respect of it self, but Relatively in respect of its Object, Christ and his Righteousness laid hold on and received by Faith. Neither should you (me-thinks) strive about the word [*Receiving*] how it should be the Act of Faith. It sufficeth, That the Scripture makes Believing in Christ, and Receiving of Christ, one and the same, *John* 1. 12. That which you say of our most famous Writers ordinarily laying the main stress of the Reformed Cause and Doctrine on a plain Error, did deserve to have been either further manifested, or quite concealed; to me it seems very injurious both to our most famous Writers, and also to the Reformed Cause and Doctrine.

52. My meaning is, That Faith justifieth, as it apprehendeth and receiveth Christ, whom the Gospel doth give for Righteousness to such as receive him, *i. e.* believe in him. And thus our Divines frequently express themselves.

Luther, *Fides justificat, quia apprehendit, & possidet illum thesaurum, scil. Christum presentem. Loc. Com. Class.* 2. *loc.* 19. *ex tom.* 4. And again, *Fides non tanquam opus justificat, sed ideò justificat, quia apprehendit mi-*

misericordiam in Christo exhibitam. Ibid. ex tom. 1. in Gen.

So *Calvin*, *Quod objicit* (*nempe* Osiander) *vim justificandi non inesse fidei ex seipsâ, sed quatenus Christum recipit, libenter admitto.* —*Fides instrumentum est duntaxat percipiendæ justitiæ.* *Inst. lib. 3. cap. 11. §. 7*

Thus also *Hemingius*, *Justificamur autem fide, non quod fides ea res sit, quâ justi sumus, sed quia est Instrumentum, quo Christum apprehendimus, & complectimur.* *De Justif. pag. mihi 141.*

Davenant, *Hoc necessariò intelligendum est, quatenus suum objectum apprehendit, & credenti applicat, nempe Christum cum salutiferâ ejus justitiâ.* And again, *Quî igitur Fides apprehendit, & applicat nobis Christi justitiam? id fidei ipsi tribuitur, quod reapse Christo debetur.* *De Just. Hab. cap. 28. Arg. & Ibid.*

Amesius. *Dolor ac detestatio peccati non potest esse causa justificans, quia non habet (N. B.) vim applicandi nobis justitiam Christi.* And again, *Apprehensio justificationi per veram fiduciam, non est simpliciter per modum objecti, sed per modum objecti (N. B.) nobis donati. Quod enim Deus donaverit fidelibus Christum, & omnia cum eo, Scriptura disertis verbis testatur,* Rom. 8. 32. *Hic tamen observandum est, accuratè loquendo, apprehensionem Christi & justitiæ ejus, esse fidem justificantem, quia justificatio nostra exurgit ex apprehensione Christi, & apprehensio justificationis, ut possessionis nostræ præsentis, fructus est, & effectum apprehensionis prioris.* *Contra Bell. Tom. 4. lib. 5. c. 4 §. 5. Ibid. §. 11.*

Pemble, [*We deny that Faith justifies us as it is a Work*, &c. *It justifies us only as the Condition required of us, and an Instrument of embracing Christ's Righteousness; nor can the contrary be proved*]. Of Justif. §. 2. *ch. 3. pag. 61.*

Mr. *Ball*, [*When Justification and Life is said to be by Faith, it is manifestly signified, That Faith receiving the Promise, doth receive Righteousness and Life freely promised*]. Of the Coven. *chap. 3. pag. 19.*

Mr. *Blake*, [*Faith as an Instrument receives Righteousness unto Justification*]. Of the Coven. *chap. 12. pag. 82.*

If you agree with me (as you say) in this particular, you will agree also with these whom I have cited, for I agree with them; their meaning and mine (so far as I

can

can discern) is the same. See also Mr. *Ball* of Faith, *Part* 1. *chap.* 10. *pag.* 135.

Ibid. For the Twofold Righteousness, which you make necessary unto Justification, I think also I have said enough before. But seeing that in the place, on which I made the *Animadversion*, you mention it as a Reason why Faith must justifie in a proper sense, and not Christ's Righteousness only, I cannot but observe how that acute and learned Man Mr. *Pemble* doth argue the quite contrary way, *viz.* That Faith doth not justifie, as taken properly, because then we should be justified by a Two-fold Righteousness. [*We are not justified* (saith he) *by two Righteousnesses existing in two divers Subjects*; *But if we be justified by the Work of Faith, we shall be justified partly by that Righteousness which is in us*, viz. *of Faith, and partly by the Righteousness of Christ without us*]. And again, [*We cannot be properly justified by both, for our own Faith, and Christ's obedience too. For if we be perfectly just in God's sight for our own Faith, what needs the imputation of Christ's Obedience to make us just? If for Christ's Righteousness we be perfectly justified, How can God account us perfectly just for our Faith?*]

Of Justif. §. 2. cap. 2. pag. 39.

Ibid. pag. 40.

Ibid. & 53. 1. If you do not oppose the Literal sense of Scripture to Figurative, I do not oppose you, but grant that Faith doth justifie figuratively, *viz.* as apprehending Christ by whom we are justified.

Ubi supra. [*In these places* (saith *Pemble*) *where it is said, Faith is imputed for Righteousness, the Phrase is to be expounded* Metonymicè, i. e. *Christ's Righteousness believed on by Faith, is imputed to the Believer for Righteousness*].

A figurative sense may be a plain sense, yet it is not a proper sense; for surely Figurative and Proper are opposite one to the other.

In Gen. Exer. 73. *Distinguendum est* (*inquit* Rivetus) *inter has phrases, quæ etsi in unum sensum conveniunt, differunt nihilominùs in eo, quòd una est figurata, altera propria. Figurata est, Fides imputatur ad justitiam. Propria est, Justitia imputatur credenti. Tum enim justitiæ nomen ponitur directè pro eâ justitiâ, cujus intuitu Deus erga nos placatus est, & pro justis habet. In primo autem Fidei tribuitur, quod ejus non est propriè sumpta. Nec enim*

enim est justitia, nec justitia loco habetur, sed objectum ejus est justitia vera, qua per fidem nobis imputatur, ut pro nostra habeatur, quam credendo amplexi sumus. Hæc si capere nolint aut veteratores Romani, *aut Novatores* Sociniani, *sufficiat nobis Apostolos autores habere, qui operibus nostris, ergò fidei quâ opus, omnem justitiæ laudem detrahunt, eamque in justitiâ, quæ sine operibus nobis imputatur, constituunt.* That the sense by me and others put on Scripture is forced, you affirm, but prove not.

2. I acknowledg but one Righteousness by which we are justified, *viz.* the Righteousness of Christ through Faith imputed unto us; see *Rom.* 5. 18. Your Similitude makes against you. For our Hands and Teeth are but Instruments whereby we are fed: so our Faith is but an Instrument whereby we are justified. And mark here, how you can use the Comparison your self, which yet you dislike when others use it. But doth the Scripture no where say, That Christ or his Righteousness is imputed unto us for Righteousness? Doth not the Scripture call Christ *our Righteousness*? Jer. 23. 6. Doth it not say, That *Christ is the end of the Law for Righteousness to every one that believeth*? Rom. 10. 4. Is not this as much as if it were said, That Christ or his Righteousness is imputed unto us for Righteousness? See also *Rom.* 5. 18, 19. and 2 *Cor.* 5. *ult.*

What Mr. *Gataker* saith concerning this Point, not having the Book which I suppose you mean, (his *Defence of Wotton*) I cannot tell: What *Wotton* and *J. Goodwin* say, I see, but am not satisfied with it. *Maccovius de Justif.* in divers Disputations doth professedly oppose *Wotton*, and answers his Objections. If you had urged any of his, or the others Arguments, I should have taken them into consideration; but seeing you do not, it is enough (I think) to oppose their authority, with the Authority of others no way inferiour unto them.

Davenant, *Scripturæ, quæ asserunt ipsam fidem nobis imputari ad justitiam, apertè indicant Christi justitiam credentibus imputari. Nam fides, qualitas in se considerata, non potest magis imputari ad justitiam, quàm aliæ qualitates ab eodem Spiritu infusæ: sed hoc necessariò intelligendum est, quatenus suum objectum apprehendit, & credenti applicat, nempe Christum cum salutiferâ ejus* *De Just. Habit. cap. 28. Arg. 8.*

ejus justitiâ. Among other Scriptures which he cites to this purpose, that is one, which you stand so much upon, [Abraham *believed God, and it was imputed to him for Righteousness*]. *Ex hisce* (*inquit*) *nos colligimus, imputari credentibus Christi justitiam, quando illam verâ fide apprehendunt.*

And *Bellarmine* objecting, *Ipsa fides imputatur ad justitiam : fides autem non est imputata Christi justitia, sed qualitas in nobis inhærens.* He answers, *Frivola est Objectio : nam nihil usitatius, quàm causæ applicanti illud tribuere, quod propriè & immediatè pertinet ad rem applicatam. Quia igitur fides apprehendit & applicat nobis justitiam Christi ; id fidei ipsi tribuitur, quod reapse Christo debetur.*

Contra Bellar. Tom. 4. Lib. 6. cap. 1. So *Amesius* answering the very same words of *Bellarmine*, saith, *Fides imputatur ad justitiam*, Rom. 4. 5. *idem est cum eo quod dicitur*, v. 6. *Deus imputat justitiam absque operibus* ; *& remittit peccata*, v. 7. *Fides autem ipsa absolutè considerata, neque est justitia sine opere, neque remissio peccatorum : necesse est igitur, ut fides imputata relativè involvat suum objectum, id est, Christum fide apprehensum.*

Loc. com. de Justif. Loc. 31. Quæst. 35. Bucan. *Quomodo igitur fides dicitur in justitiam imputari ? Non absolutè, sed relativè, &c.* And having cited *Rom.* 3. 22, 25. he saith, *Quibus locis Fidei voce* (*metonymiâ continentis pro re contentâ*) *Christus crucifixus intelligitur, sed fide apprehensus. Hoc sensu fides* Abrahæ *imputata est ei ad justitiam, seu pro justitiâ*, Rom. 4. 9. *Et fides cuilibet credenti imputatur ad justitiam, i. e. Christus crucifixus apprehensus fide censetur nostra justitia ; censetur, inquam, à Deo è tribunali suo sententiam justitiæ pronunciante. Quemadmodum igitur manus, quæ recipit thesaurum donatum, non ditat, sed thesaurus : sic nec fidei opus, vel actio nos justificat, sed ipse Christus, quem fide apprehendimus. Et hoc est, quod Theologi Orthodoxi dicunt, nos justificari fide correlativè, & ratione Objecti fidem imputari in justitiam. Quæ assertio inde manifesta est, quod apud* Paulum, *Rom.* 3. 27, 28. *opponitur hæc enuntiatio, Fide sumus justi, propositioni huic, Justificamur ex operibus, tanquam contradictoriæ. Quarè ex naturâ contradictionis perspicuum est, non justificari quemquam Fide in quantum*

tum est opus sive nostrum, sive Dei in nobis, sed in quantum Christi meritum includit.

Rivet; *Fides excludit seipsam, quà opus est. Unum enim opus non justificat, nec quidem potest justificare. Redeundum ergo ad Controversiæ statum, quo Fides statuitur justificare, non quatenus est opus, sive per se, sed relativè, quatenus significat applicationem justitiæ Christi, i.e. non nostræ, sed alienæ.* The same Author also saith thus, *Apostolus non distinguit inter Opera Legis, & Opera Fidei, sed in hoc negotio Fidem semper quibuslibet aperibus opponit. Unde etiam sequitur fidem non justificare, quatenus est opus justitiæ, sed quatenus apprehendit justitiam Christi.* In Gen. Exer. 73. Disput. De Fide Justif. §. 19.

That we are justified by Faith, is without controversie, the Scripture being expres for it: but when you say, That Faith properly taken doth justifie, which the Scripture saith not, in this I dissent from you. And also because you make Faith one Righteousness, by which we are justified, as indeed you must, if properly we be justified by it.

Davenant urgeth from *Rom.* 5. 18. That there is *unum tantùm δικαίωμα, quod ad justificationem vitæ potest valere, nempe unius Christi obedientia.* Whence he infers, *Justificatio igitur vitæ non redundat in nos ab ullâ qualitate in nobismet ipsis inhærente, sed ab hâc justitiâ completâ Mediatoris nobis donatâ & imputatâ. Nostra justitia inhærens non habet in se δικαίωμα, hoc est, perfectionem justitiæ completam, & absolutam. Ergo non potest producere in nobis δικαίωσιν ζωῆς, &c.* Ubi supra Arg. 11.

You mistake my Argument, and do not mind the Text which I alledged, *viz.* Acts 13. 39. *By him all that believe are justified,* &c. Therefore not only all that believe in Christ are justified, but it is by him that they are justified, *i.e.* by his Obedience, as it is expressed *Rom.* 5. 19. So that Christ's Obedience is that which is properly imputed for Righteousness, though it be so imputed only to those that believe; Faith to apprehend it, is required of us, that it may be imputed to us; and in that respect Faith is said to be imputed for Righteousness.

1. The first Note seems to shew thus much, That some may make Faith an Instrument of Justification, and yet deny that we are properly justified by it as by an Instru-

ment: Though if this be granted, I see not what you gain by it. For (as I said in the *Animadversion*) they that make Faith an Instrument of Justification, when they deny that we are properly justified by Faith; they mean, That Faith is not the * Righteousness by which we are justified; and that we are therefore only said to be justified by Faith, because by Faith we receive the Righteousness of Christ, by which Righteousness properly we are justified. That this is the meaning of our Divines, appears by that which I have before alledged.

* *Non est justitia, nec justitia loco habetur, &c. Rivet* before cited.

2. Therefore who those be, of whom you speak, I do not know: However, I do not see that your Objections are of force. For Faith is not wholly excluded as to the Text, though it be so interpreted, as that by [Faith imputed] is meant Christ and his Righteousness, *viz.* * as apprehended by Faith; and I presume that they whom you tax, did so understand it. And this doth not exclude Faith, but include it. Your Question therefore seems captious, [*If by Faith be meant Christ's Righteousness, then what word doth signifie Faith?*] For by Faith is not simply meant Christ's Righteousness, but as it is apprehended by Faith.

* See *Bucan* before cited.

3. *Davenant*'s words, which I cited, are clearly to the purpose to which I cited them; neither do I see any thing in them, which argue him to have been of another mind than I am of. Whereas you add, [*It seems he discerned the mistake of them, that affirm Christ's Active Righteousness as such to be our Righteousness*]. I think your Scribe did mistake, and it should be, [he discerned not]. For therein indeed, in that Chapter, but not in the words which I cited, he differs both from you and me: But I was willing to let that pass, both because it is nothing to our present purpose; and also I like not to shew my dissent from any eminent Writer, except I be forced to it.

4. What you say you will alledge out of *Davenant* against me, is to be considered when it is alledged. But here you profess your self far from approving what he saith, *viz.* That Christ's Righteousness *est formalis causa justificationis ex communi nostrorum sententiâ*; You should say, Christ's Righteousness imputed to us: for so *Davenant* hath it in the words which I cited. And you should also consider how immediately before those words

words he explained himself about the *formalis causa justificationis.*

For *Bellarmine* objecting, That though *Christi obedientia sit meritoria causa justificationis nostræ, propter quam Deus nos justificat*, yet *Justitia inhærens potest esse formalis, per quam justificati constituimur*; and taxing *Chemnitius* for stating the question thus, *Quid sit id, propter quod Deus hominem in gratiam recipiat, &c.* He answers, *Sed immemorem se hîc præbet Jesuita, qui eodem modo & ipse loquitur de Just. lib. 2. cap. 1.* [*De Causâ formali, propter quam homo dicitur justus coram Deo, disserendum est*]. *Atque reverâ in Justificatione talis causa formalis ponenda est, quæ simul & meritoria esse possit. Nisi enim illam contineat dignitatem in se, propter quam homo ritè justificatus reputetur, nunquam erit formalis causa, per quam justificatus existat in conspectu Dei.* De Just. Habit. cap. 22.

And again, *Ut itaque seponamus Philosophicas Speculationes de naturâ causæ formalis, quando formalem causam quærimus justificationis nostræ, quærimus propter quod peccator in gratiam Dei recipitur, per quod immediatè Deo gratus, & ad vitam æternam acceptus fiat, cujus beneficio damnatoriam Legis sententiam evadere, denique quo inti possit, & debeat ad cœlestis Judicis favorem & approbationem consequendam.* Ibid.

And again, *Quod igitur dicit* Bellarminus, *impossibile esse, ut per justitiam Christi imputatam formaliter justi simus, si per formaliter intelligat inhærenter, nugas agit, &c. Si autem per formalem causam intelligat illud ipsum, quod Deus intuetur quando quemvis peccatorem justificat, &c. dico hoc non esse inhærentem ullam qualitatem, sed Christi obedientiam & justitiam credentibus gratuitâ Dei misericordiâ donatam atque imputatam. Impossibile quidem est, ut hæc justitia, quæ in Christo inhæret, sit etiam nostra per modum inhæsionis; sed quando tanquam membra unimur Christo capiti, non est impossibile, ut nostra fiat per modum donationis, & salutiferæ participationis: atque hic modus sufficit, ut in Justificatione formalis causæ rationem, efficaciam, & similitudinem obtineat.* Ibid. cap. 24. ad 5.

Me-thinks all this should suffice to satisfie any ingenuous Man, and to cut off all occasion of quarrelling about

the term, when there is so full and frequent explication of the meaning of it.

Contra Bellar. tom. 4. l. 6. c. 1. §. 1. So also *Amesius* having out of *Contarenus* distinguished of Righteousness, and stated the Question about the formal cause of Justification, he saith, *Hoc sensu nos negamus formalem causam absolutæ (N. B.) nostræ justificationis esse justitiam in nobis inhærentem.*

Ibid. §. 22. And again, *Non aliâ ratione formaliter nos justos nominari, & esse dicimus imputatâ Christi justitiâ, quam quâ is cujus debitum ab altero solvitur nominatur & est ab illo debito liber & immunis; & quâ is cui procuratus est alterius favor aut gratia, nominatur & est alteri gratus.* For that which you cite out of his *Med. l. 1. c. 27. §. 12.* I find there only these words, *Christi igitur justitia in justificatione fidelibus imputatur*, Phil. 3. 9. Those which you add are not in my Edition, *viz. Quatenus ejus merito justi coram Deo reputamur.*

Edit. 3. per Rob. Allotum Londini, 1629. However they are not repugnant to what I have cited, both from him and *Davenant*, because (as *Davenant* expressly notes) *Causa formalis hic etiam est meritoria. Alsted*'s words, as you cite them, [*Christus est justitia nostra in sensu causali, non in sensu formali*] carry no good sense, at least are not so accurate. For surely if *Formalis Causa*, then *Sensus Formalis* is also *Sensus Causalis.*

You add, [So *Rivet Disp. de Fide.*] but you should also have noted the Section. Indeed §. 13. he saith, That *Bellarmine* doth *affingere nobis sententiam de justitia Christi, tanquam causâ formali.* And elsewhere

Colledg. Controvers. Disp. 34. he saith, *Forma justificationis consistit in justitia Christi imputatione, propter quam nobis remittuntur peccata.*

Instit. lib. 2. So *Trelcatius*, *Forma justificationis, Activè sumpta, est Actualis Justitiæ Christi gratuita imputatio, quâ meritum & obedientia Christi nobis applicantur, vi communionis arctissimæ, quâ ille in nobis, & nos in illo.*

Of Justifying Faith *Sect. 2. chap. 18.* Dr. *Jackson* saith, That *to demand what is the formal cause of Justification, is as if one should ask what is the Latin for* Manus: *and that it is the folly or knavery of our Adversaries to demand a formal Cause of their Justification, who deny themselves to be formally just in the sight of God.* [*He alone* (saith he) *is formally just, who hath that form inherent in himself, by which he*

he is denominated just, and so accepted of God: as Philosophers deny the Sun to be formally hot, because it hath no form of heat inherent in it, but only produceth heat in other Bodies].

Thus there is difference among our Divines about the term, but they agree in the thing. Some would have no formal Cause of Justification at all; some would have such a Cause, but would not have Christ's Righteousness imputed, but the imputation of Christ's Righteousness to be it: yet both the one and the other do indeed hold the Righteousness of Christ to be the formal Cause of Justification, in that sense as *Davenant* and *Ames* do explain it.

1. As Faith alone is the Condition of our Justification, so also Faith alone as continued (though it is not continued alone) is the Condition of our Continued Justification. 54.

Neque etiam (faith *Calvin*) *sic putemus commendari post gratuitam justificationem opera, ut & ipsa in locum justificandi hominis posteà succedant, aut ejusmodi officium cum Fide* (*N. B.*) *partiantur. Nisi enim perpetuò maneat solida Fides justificatio, illorum immunditiæ detegetur. Nihil autem absonum est, sic Fide hominem justificari, ut non ipse modò justus sit sed opera quoque ejus supra dignitatem justa censeantur.* *Instit. lib. 3. cap. 17. § 9.*

So Mr. *Ball*, [*Faith doth not begin to apprehend Life, and then leave it to works, that we might attain the accomplishment by them, but it doth ever rest upon the Promise until we come to enjoy it*]. Of Faith, Part 2. Chap. 4. p. 252, 253.

2. I know no accusation but of the Law of Works, though in case of unbelief and impenitency that Accusation be aggravated by the Law of Grace.

Though *Calvin* thinks not that *Joh.* 5. 45. [*Do not think that I will accuse you to my Father; there is one that accuseth you, even* Moses, *&c.*] to be to this purpose, as some do; yet he grants, That it is *Legis proprie reos peragere infideles.* *Calvin* in *Joh.* 5. 45.

To question whether he spake of the Law of Works, were to question whether the Sun shineth at noon-day. When any is accused to be an Infidel, or finally impenitent, or a sinner against the Holy Ghost, as it is a sin that he is accused of, so the Accusation is from the Law: but as Unbelief or Impenitency (for why you bring in the sin against the Holy Ghost, I do not know) doth import

a want of the Condition required in the Gospel, so (as I have said before) it is no new accusation, but only a re-inforcing of a former accusation; and so the refelling of this Accusation, by shewing the fruits of Faith and Repentance, is not properly a justifying of our selves by any thing in our selves, but only a proving and manifesting that we are indeed justified by the Righteousnes of Christ imputed to us.

3. The imperfection of our Faith and Obedience doth prove that it is no Righteousnes by which we can be justified; consider always, that I speak of absolute and universal Justification.

Instit. lib. 3. c. 11. §. 7. *Si per se* (saith *Calvin*) *vel intrinsecâ, ut loquuntur, virtute justificaret fides, ut est semper debilis & imperfecta, non efficeret hoc nisi ex parte; sic manca esset justitia, qua fractulum salutis nobis conferret.*

De Instit. Habit. cap. 26. Arg. 3. Ibid. Arg. 4. So *Davenant*, *Ad justificationem efficiendam non sufficit justitia suo quodam modo perfecta, & aliquo modo imperfecta; sed necesse est eam esse legali modo perfectam, & omnibus suis numeris absolutam.* And again, *Nulla justitia coram Deo justificat, sed quæ ad amussim Legis perfecta est: Sed nostra inhærens non est talis, &c.*

De Justif. Disp. 11. Thus also *Maccovius*, *Quod nobis imputatur ad justitiam,* (*nempe propriè & per se, seu respectu sui*) *id debet esse perfectissimum, ut consistere possit cum judicio Dei,* Rom. 2. 2. *At Fides non est perfectissima,* 1 Cor. 13. 9.

Ibid. To me it seems not hard to be certain of the meaning of that place, *Luke* 7. 47. [*Many sins are forgiven her, for she loved much*]. It appears (as I noted) plainly enough by the Context, what the meaning is, *viz.* not that her love was the cause of the forgiveness of her sins, but the forgiveness of her sins the cause of her love: And you see how sharply *Calvin* (whose words I cited) censures those that interpret it otherwise.

In Luc. 7. 42. The Parable going before those words are so clear, That *Maldonate* is forced to say, *Videtur ex hâc parabolâ non fuisse colligendum, quod Christus collegit, multa peccata illi mulieri remitti, quia multum dilexisset, sed contrà propterea eam multum dilexisse, quòd multa illi peccata remissa essent.—Quæ res speciosam* Calvino, *& cæteris hæreticis errandi occasionem præbuit, negantibus huic mulieri propter præcedentia charitatis opera remissa peccata;*

peccata; illa verò verba, quoniam dilexit multum, sic interpretantibus, ut dictio illa quoniam, non causam, sed effectum, & consequentiam significet: quod utinam nemo Catholicorum secutus esset.

And see how poorly and pittifully he comes off, viz. either thus, *Ut Christum inversâ parabolâ usum fuisse deceremus. q. d. Sicut ille dilexit multum, quia multum illi remissum fuerat; ita huic mulieri è contrario, quia dilexit multum, remissa sunt peccata multa.* Or, which he rather inclines unto, thus, *Quod Christus hoc loco rogat, Quis ergo eum plus diliget etsi futurum tempus est, tamen ex consuetudine loquendi vim præteriti habere puto. q. d. Quem tu judicas, ex effectu conjecturam faciens, plus anè Dominum suum delexisse? Utrum illi magis amicum fuisse, cum amicitiæ causâ fœnerator debitum utrique remiserit?* What straits was this acute Man driven to, because he was resolved to hold the Conclusion, and yet saw how ill it did suit with the Premises?

1. What others, of whom you speak do, I know not; they may answer for themselves. *Ibid.*

2. I take affiance (which is a Believing in, or Relying on) to be an Act of Faith it self, the Act of Faith being as well *Credere in*, as *simpliciter Credere*. But internal Obedience or Love, (for these you make both one, though indeed Believing it self is inward Obedience as well as Love, the one being commanded as well as the other) is not the Act of Faith, though caused by Faith; not *actus elicitus*, though *actus imperatus*: therefore this is not so immediate a product of Faith as the other.

3. I conceive Affiance to be a part of Justifying-Faith, and not only a Fruit of it. *To believe in Christ*, which is as much as to rely on him, and to have affiance in him, is requisite unto Justification. *He that believeth on him is not condemned*, John 3. 18.

1. As Justification is begun upon sole Believing, so is it also continued and consummated. The Scripture (so far as I see) makes Justification simply and absolutely to depend on Faith, and not only in respect of the beginning of it: yet (it is true) Justification is neither begun, nor continued, nor consummated upon such a Believing as is not attended with other Duties. That this is the Uniform Doctrine of the prime Protestants, I *Ibid.*

shewed by the confession of our greatest Adversary, to which you oppose nothing.

Multa ad justificationem requiruntur quæ non justificant Amef. *contra* Bellar. *tom.4. l.5. cap.1.§.1. De Reconcil.* part 1. *lib.2.c.18.*

2. Though some other things besides Faith must go before Justification, yet do they not therefore justifie as well as Faith, it being only Faith that doth apprehend Christ, by whom so apprehended we are justified.

Neque tamen hæc fides (saith *Wotton*) *spem, dilectionem, timorem, pœnitentiam excludere censenda est, quasi ad eum, qui justificatus est, non pertinerent; sed hæc omnia ab officio justificandi* (*N. B.*) *significantur pertinere excludi. Atque hoc quidem justificandi munus soli Fidei convenire, his rationibus ostendo. Quia solâ Fide rectà in Christum tendimus, ut per eum justificemur, & promissiones Dei de justificatione amplectimur. 2. Ubicunque Spiritus Sanctus disertis verbis loquitur de justificatione impii, ejusque causas ex hominis parte assignat, nullam ejusmodi causam assignat nisi fidem.*

Loc. Com. Class. 2. Loc.19. de Justif. ex Tom. 2. in Gen.

But hear also *Luther*, who doth both thunder and lighten in this particular: *Cur insane Sophista, asseris dilectionem, spem, & alias virtutes? Scio has esse insignia Dei dona, divinitùs mandata, per Spiritum Sanctum in nostris cordibus excitari & als. Scio fidem sine his donis non existere; sed nunc nobis quæstio est, quid cujusque proprium sit. Tenes manu varia semina, non autem quæro ego, quæ cum quibus conjuncta sint, sed quæ cujusque propria virtus. Hic apertè dic quid faciat Sola Fides, non cum quibus virtutibus conjuncta sit. Sola autem Fides apprehendit promissionem, credit promittenti Deo, Deo porrigenti aliquid admovet manum, & id accipit. Hoc proprium solius Fidei est; Charitas, Spes, Patientia habent alias materias, circa quas versantur; habent alios limites, intra quos consistunt. Non enim amplectuntur promissionem, sed mandata exequuntur; audiunt Deum mandantem, non audiunt Deum promittentem, ut Fides facit.*

55. *Ibid.*

In the next Section we are agreed.

To this long Section I need not say much. For now that you explain your self, there seems to be but little difference betwixt us. All that I aim at, is this, That Christ simply considered, is not the Object of Justifying Faith, but Christ as promised in the Gospel: so that to believe in Christ, doth imply a believing of the Promise, and that not only so as to assent unto it, but so also as to

apply

apply it. And therefore we often find in Scripture, That the Axiome or Propoſition concerning Chriſt, is made the Object of Juſtifying and Saving Faith, ſee *Rom.* 10. 9. 1 *Joh.* 5. 1. *Acts* 8. 37. *Joh.* 6. 69. And thus our Divines often ſpeak of Faith juſtifying as apprehending the Promiſes.

Sola Fides (ſaith *Luther*) *apprehendit Promiſſionem.* *Locis paulò ante citatis.*

So *Wotton*; *Solâ Fide Promiſſiones Dei de juſtificatione amplectimur.*

And Mr. *Ball*, [*For Faith only doth behold and receive the Promiſes of Life and Mercy*, &c. *When therefore Juſtification and Life is ſaid to be by Faith, it is manifeſtly ſignified, That Faith receiving the Promiſe, doth receive Righteouſneſs and Life freely promiſed*]. Of the Coven. *ch.* 3. *p.* 19.

But I willingly grant, That the Axiome, Propoſition or Promiſe doth but ſerve to convey Chriſt unto us, and the apprehending and receiving of him, is the Faith by which we are juſtified. Only I ſay, it is Chriſt in the Promiſe, or Chriſt promiſed, who muſt be apprehended and received unto Juſtification.

Fidei objectum quod (ſaith *Ameſ.*) *vel materiale*; *eſt quicquid à Deo revelatur ac proponitur credendum*, &c. —— *Hoc objectum eſt immediatè ſemper aliquod axioma vel enuntiatio ſub ratione veri*; *ſed illud, in quo principaliter terminatur Fides, de quo, & propter quod aſſenſus præbetur illi axiomati per fidem, eſt Ens incomplexum ſub ratione boni*, Rom. 4. 21. Heb. 11. 13. *Actus enim credentis non terminatur ad axioma, ſed ad rem. fatentibus Scholaſticorum clariſſimis. Ratio eſt, quia non formamus axiomata, niſi ut per ea de rebus cognitionem habeamus. Principalis igitur terminus, in quem tendit actus credentis, eſt res ipſa, quæ in axiomate præcipuè ſpectatur.* *Medul. l.* 1. *c.* 5. §. 21. *Ibid.* §. 23, 24.

All this I like well enough, ſave that he ſeems to make the Act of Faith exerciſed about an Axiome or Enunciation to be only Aſſent, as to that which is true; whereas ſomtimes it is alſo Apprehenſion and Receiving as of that which is good, though (it's true) this Act of Faith is principally terminated in the thing, which the Axiome or Enunciation doth contain in it.

1. I do not ſay, That the receiving of Chriſt as King is *Fides quæ juſtificat*, though I grant it is *Actus fidei quæ juſtificat*. 2. I 56, & 57.

2. I refer [*quâ*] to [*Justificat*] *q. d.* [Faith which justifieth, doth receive Christ as King; yet this is not the Act of Faith, whereby it justifieth]. Or if you will, thus; Christ as King is the object of Faith, which justifieth, but not of Faith as it justifieth. Indeed Faith, which justifieth hath respect to the whole Word of God, yet only to the Word of Promise concerning Christ, and the Mercy of God in Christ, as it justifieth.

Contra Bellar. Tom. 4. Lib. 5. c. 1. §. 1, 2. *Non tam quæritur* (*inquit* Amesius) *quæ aut quid sit Fides, quæ justificat, quàm quæ sit ratio quâ propriè dicitur justificare.* And presently after follow the words, which I cited in the Animadversions. Again, *Una & eadem* (*inquit*) *Fides est, quâ placemus Deo ad reconciliationem, & jam reconciliati dirigimur & sustentamur ad placendum ipsi in Obedientiâ novâ.* And again, *Ibid. cap. 2. §. 1. Ibid. §. 8.* *Fidem illam, quæ justificat, præsupponere, involvere, & inferre concedimus fidem Historiæ, atque etiam* (*in quibusdam olim*) *miraculorum; sed historiæ ac miraculorum fidem sæpè à justificatione separari palam est; Quamvis multa sint exercitia & objecta Fidei, non tamen justificans est, nisi prout respicit misericordiam Dei in Christo. Hinc omnes illi, quorum fides in eo capite* (Heb. 11.) *laudatur, collimabant ad promissionem illam misereordiæ in Christo.*

3. Where do I say, That the receiving of Christ as King doth justifie, that you ask me in what sense it doth so? I say, Justifying Faith doth receive Christ as King, but not as justifying; or that Faith in that respect doth not justifie.

4. Faith as the Condition of Justification is the receiving of Christ as satisfying for us.

5. If Christ's Satisfaction only be our Righteousness, by which we are justified; and Christ as Priest only made Satisfaction for us, then by receiving Christ as Priest only we are justified. This you might perceive was the meaning of the Argument, though I left out the word [only].

And here also I have Mr. *Blake* agreeing with me, as (I think) in every point, wherein we differ, if he have occasion to treat of it. Of the Coven. c. 12. p. 79. ' [It is true (*faith he*) that ' Faith accepts Christ as Lord as well as Saviour: but it ' is the acceptation of him as Saviour, not as Lord, that ' justifies. Christ rules his People as a King, teacheth ' them as a Prophet, but makes atonement for them as a ' Priest,

'Priest, by giving himself in Sacrifice, his Blood for re-
'mission of Sins. These must be distinguished, but not
'divided: Faith hath an eye at all, the Blood of Christ,
'the Command of Christ, the Doctrine of Christ: but
'as it ties and fastens on his Blood, so it justifies. *He is*
'*set out a propitiation through Faith in his Blood*, Rom.
'3. 24. not through Faith in his Command. It is the
'Blood of Christ that cleanseth from all sin, and not the
'Sovereignty of Christ. These confusions of the di-
'stinct parts of Christ's Mediatorship, and the several
'offices of Faith may not be suffered. Scripture assigns
'each its particular Place and Work. Sovereignty doth
'not cleanse, nor Blood command us: Faith in his
'Blood, not Faith yeelding to his Sovereignty, doth justi-
'fie us. There are several acts of Justifying-Faith,
'*Heb.* 11. but those are not acts of Justification. It is
'not *Abraham*'s Obedience, *Moses* Self-denyal, *Gideon*
'or *Sampson*'s Valour, that was their Justification, but
'his Blood, who did enable them in these things by his
'Spirit].

Your Similitude is not suitable; for a Woman receiving a Man for her Husband, may be enriched or dignified by him, though she never look at him as rich or honourable, but only as her Husband. But we must look at Christ as a Priest, and as making Satisfaction for us, that so we may be justified by him. For the Scripture doth set forth Christ unto us in that respect for our Justification; see *Apoc.* 1. 5. *Heb.* 9. 26. 2 *Cor.* 5. *ult.* *Rom.* 8. 34. where those words [*It is Christ that died*] shew how Christ doth justifie us, and free us from condemnation, *viz.* by dying, and so satisfying for our sins. That which follows of Christ's Resurrection, *&c.* seems (as to our Justification) but for our more full assurance of the benefit of Christ's Death, and for the effectual application of his Satisfaction, which he made for us by his Death, that so we may be justified by him.

6. You grant, that Christ, not as King, but as Priest, doth justifie us meritoriously and satisfactorily; and that is it which I urge, That Christ's Satisfaction, which as Priest he made for us, is that whereby, or for which we are justified. Now we speak of receiving Christ unto Justification, therefore we must consider him as satisfying for us, and so receive him as to that purpose, *viz.*

our

our Justification; though (I grant) whole Christ, or Christ in respect of all his Offices must be received; neither may we think to have him as a Priest to satisfie for us, except we also have him as a Prophet to instruct us, and as a King to govern us. So I usually Preach and Teach.

57. (p. 69.) 1. When you say, That I leave the Errour in his Language, but not in his Sense, your words are ambignous. For they may import, That I leave, *i. e.* relinquish and desert the Error the one way, but not the other. Or that I leave, *i. e.* let the Error abide and remain in his Language, but not in his Sense. This I take to be your meaning, for else you could not say (except ironically, which I do not suspect) that it is a fair Exposition, and that you like it. I have no reason to strive about another's words, especially not knowing how they are brought in: but I think meet to interpret words in the best sense that they will bear: neither do I yet see but those words which you tax as foully erroneous, may admit that fair interpretation which I made of them.

2. Where *Amesius* hath those words, you do not shew: But surely he there speaks *de Fide Justificante qua tali*. For otherwise he should neither agree with the Truth, nor with himself in saying, *Christus est objectum adæquatum Fidei justificantis*. The whole Word of God is the Object of Justifying-Faith, though not of Faith as Justifying; and so much is acknowledged by *Amesius*, as appears by his words before cited. Neither again doth he speak of Christ in all respects, but as Christ is the Propitiation for our sins, as is clear by that very place which you now take into consideration.

Besides, I find *Amesius* to have such words as you mention, but withall to add such, as plainly to express what I say. *Christus* (*inquit*) *est adæquatum objectum Fidei, quatenus* (*N. B.*) *Fides Justificat. Fides etiam non aliâ ratione justificat, nisi quatenus apprehendit illam justitiam,* (*N. B.*) *propter quam justificamur.*

Medul. lib. 1. c. 27. §. 17.

Ibid. & 58. (p. 70.) 1. The Text (1 *John* 4. 19.) cannot (I think) be rightly understood but as I interpreted it. For *v.* 10, 11. the Apostle speaketh of God's great love manifested unto us, in giving his Son for us. And *v.* 19. he shews whence it is that we love God, *viz.* from hence, that God loved us first, *i. e.* we apprehending the Love of God to us,

us, answer his love with love again. *Amat non immeritò, qui amatus sine merito*, as *Bernard* speaketh. Yet we must first find and feel the love of God towards us, before we can love him for what he hath done for us.

2. There is more than a bare assenting Act of Faith going before the Love, of which I speak.

3. Embracing, which from *Heb.* 11. 13. I note to be the compleating Act of Justifying-Faith, doth include or presuppose *amorem desiderii*; we can never sincerely embrace Christ, if we do not desire him: but *amor delectationis*, or *complacentiæ* doth follow after embracing, *viz.* when the thing desired is enjoyed. All that you add, holds only in respect of the former kind, not in respect of the latter.

58. 1. There are divers kinds of Love, but I speak of that Love which differs from Desire; and so did you seem to understand it, as I noted from your words, *Aphorism*, p. 267.

2. Whereas you say, [*There is no need of Faith to make it present, before it can be accepted and loved*]; you cannot by Faith mean Assent, for that, you grant, doth go before Love and Acceptance. And if by Faith you mean Acceptance, surely there must be Acceptance, before a thing can be accepted, though in time these go together. But perhaps you only mean, That though Faith as an Assent, must go before in time, and as an Acceptance must go before in Nature, yet not so as to make a thing present. For you add, That God's Offer doth make it present. But though the Offer be present, yet the thing offered is not present, so as the Object of the Love of Complacency must be: for it must be present by way of Enjoyment, but the offer of a thing can only make it to be hoped for; so that the thing, though it be offered, yet until it be accepted, it is absent, because it is not enjoyed. The thing offered must be desirously, and in that respect lovingly accepted; but it must first be accepted, and then loved, so as to joy and delight in it.

3. We look at Christ as enjoyed, when we love him with the Love of Complacency and Delight, of which Love I speak.

Gaudium

Theolog. Natur. Tit. 95. *Gaudium oritur ex hoc,* (saith *Raimundus de Sebunda*) *quòd aliqua res scit se habere id, quod habet, & non ex hoc dunt axat, quod habet.*

There must both be the Having of a thing, and also the Knowing that we have it, that we may rejoyce in it.

4. As Assent must go before Acceptance, so must Acceptance go before that Love, of which I speak.

Ibid. 1. I did not say, or think, that you thought so of all Love, *viz.* that it considereth its Object as present or enjoyed; for there is no distinguishing here of these, as I have shewed before; the Object is not present, except it be enjoyed. You grant that *Amor Complacentiæ* doth so consider its Object; and I thought you had meant that kind of Love, because you did distinguish Love from Desire. Therefore I said, [Love as you take it, considereth its Object as present and enjoyed] *viz.* Love as distinguished from Desire. I know not (I confess) what to make of Love, but either a Desire, if the Object be absent, or a Delight, if the Object be present.

2. That which you say concerning Acceptance, Election, and Consent, is nothing to me, who do not enquire whether they be divers acts or no, but only shew that they go before Enjoyment, and so differ from Love, as I take it, *viz.* Love of Complacency, which doth follow Enjoyment.

59. I take the Love of Desire to go before Acceptance, and the Love of Complacency to follow after it. Although *Amare & velle bonum* be one and the same, yet this *velle bonum vel est cum desiderio, si objectum absit, vel cum Complacentiâ, si adsit.*

Part 1. Quæst. 20. Art. 1. * *Nempe prius tempore, non naturâ.* *Aquinas* doth not satisfie me, when he saith, *Nullus desiderat aliquid nisi bonum amatum neque aliquis gaudet nisi de bono amato*; if he mean, that a thing is *amatum prius* quàm desideratum.* The very *Desiderare* (I think) is *Amare*, and so is *Gaudere* also; but the one is *Amare quod abest*, the other *Amare quod adest.* So you in the next Section say, [*Desire is Love, and Complacency is Love*].

Ibid. 1. I did not doubt, much less deny that there is *Amor Desiderii*, as well as *Amor Complacentiæ*; only I shewed, that your words there must be meant of the former, in which sense I did not oppose you, but as it is taken in the other

other sense; and so you seemed to take it before, because you did expressly distinguish it from Desire.

Neither is your second any thing against me.

3. The Scripture is not so much to be interpreted according to the most comprehensive sense, as according to the most proper sense, *viz.* that which doth best agree with the Context and other places of Scripture.

Your fourth containeth nothing but a *Sarcasm* very unworthily used of such a worthy Man as *Calvin* was.

1. The places, which you alledg (*John* 16. 27. and 14. 21.) do not prove, that Love, *viz.* our Love is an antecedent Condition of God's Love, and Christ's Love to us, so that we must first love God and Christ, before we can be reconciled unto God in Christ. For because we are reconciled unto God in Christ, therefore we love God and Christ, 1 *John* 4. 19. The meaning of those other places (as *Calvin* notes) is this, That they that love God, *insculptum habent in cordibus Paterni ejus amoris testimonium*: To which may be added, That God will still manifest his Love to them more and more. *Ibid.*

2. Not only Love, but Obedience also must go before Glorification; but it doth not therefore follow, That they must go before Justification, as your self hold that Obedience doth not as we are at first justified. That there is any other Condition of Justification at last than at first, is more than I can find in Scripture.

1. What some have answered, and what you have read in others I know not; you cite none whose Works are extant, but only Mr. *Ball*, and him at large, [*On the Covenant*] but where in that Book you do not shew. I find there that he doth use the words [*Instrument*] and [*Condition*] promiscuously. *Ibid.*

[*The Covenant of Grace* (saith he) *exacteth no other thing inherent in us, as a Cause* (viz. *instrumental*) *of Justification, or a Condition* (*N.B.*) *in respect of which we are justified, but Faith alone*]. This is point-blank against that which you say of him. And again, [*It is* (saith he) *the sole Instrumental or Conditional* (*N.B.*) *Cause required on our part to Justification*]. Of the Coven. p. 65. *Ibid.*

As I shewed before in the *Animadversions, ad pag.* 243. our Divines say, *Fides sola justificat, sed Fides quæ justificat, non est sola*: but they mean that Love and Obedience follow as the fruits and effects of Faith.

Thus

Thus *Stapleton* somewhere (I cannot now cite the place) testifyeth of them, saying, *Omnes ad unum Protestantes docent Fidem justificantem esse vivam, & operantem per charitatem, atque alia bona opera.*

2. I grant, That *Amor Concupiscentiæ* is prerequisite if you will call it so, as I see not but you may, though *Amor Concupiscentiæ* is usually opposed to *Amor Amicitiæ*, and so you speak of it, *p.* 58. And if you speak not of *Amor Complacentiæ*, then neither do I speak against you. For of that do I speak, and had reason (I think) to understand you as speaking of it, because you spake of Love as distinct from Desire. Perhaps you speak of it only in respect of its Generical Nature, abstracting from the consideration of either Desire or Complacency, which are the Species of it: but surely these two taking up the whole nature of Love, that Love which is not the one of these, must needs be the other. We accept or chuse a thing, because we first Love, *i. e.* desire it, or (as we use to say) have a mind to it: and having accepted and chosen it, we further love it, so as to delight in it, except our Love turn into Hatred, as *Amnon*'s unchast Love did: but the very Accepting or Chusing of a thing is not (that I see) properly a Loving of it.

3. I grant, that all Love doth not presuppose Acceptance, Consent, *&c.* the Love of Desire doth not; but the Love of Complacency doth. This is all that I have desired, and so much you have yeelded.

Ibid. 1. The distinction of *Fides quæ*, and *Fides quâ*, as it is frequently used by our Learned Writers, so it doth hold good notwithstanding any thing you have said, or (I suppose) can say against it.

Disp. de Fide Just. §. 16. *Quamvis hanc controversiam elevent*, (saith *Rivet*, speaking of the Remonstrants) *nec ciccum* (*ut loquuntur*) *interdiunt, an Fides quæ est viva, an Fides quâ est viva, ad justificationem requiratur, & Logicam tantùm pugnam esse velint, Logica tamen hæc pugna realem continet magni momenti. Siquis enim dicat, Christus qui homo est infinitus, & Christus quâ homo est infinitus, nemo sanus existimabit nihil differre has enuntiationes.*

I grant you more than you require, That not only Christ as Lord, but even the whole Word of God is the Object of Justifying Faith; but not therefore of Faith as Justifying. The Hand may receive both Meat and Mony, yet

yet it doth not enrich, as it receiveth Meat, nor feed as it receiveth Mony.

2. If Christ's Satisfaction be our Righteousness, (which I think you have ever affirmed, though you would also have another Righteousness of our own, and that unto Justification;) then I see not but that I may speak of Faith laying hold on and apprehending Christ's Satisfaction. For though the Satisfaction was made unto God, yet it was made for us; and in that respect we are to lay hold on it, and receive it, and not only to assent to the truth of it.

You somewhere cite *Bellarmine* yeelding unto us thus much, *Imputari nobis Christi merita, quia nobis donata sunt, & possumus ea Deo Patri offerre pro peccatis nostris, quoniam Christus suscepit super se onus satisfaciendi pro nobis, nosque Deo Patri reconciliandi.*

Which words also *Amesius* doth cite, and interpret to be as much as if he did say, *Christi merita sunt nobis à Deo donata, ut possimus ea pro nobis Deo offerre tanquam Satisfactionem pro peccatis nostris.* *Contra Bellar. Tom. 4. l. 6. c. 1. §. 22.*

It is *Satisfactio Christi*, though by Faith it becomes *Nostra*, which we must *offerre Deo*: but first we must by Faith receive it, before we can have any interest in it, to make such use of it. Faith justifieth (I grant) as a Condition, because it is required of us, that we may be partakers of Christ's Righteousness; but it is not Faith properly, but the Righteousness of Christ by which we are justified. (p. 72.)

Recte Contarenus (saith *Ames.*) *in Tract. de Justif. Fide justificamur, non formaliter, sicut Albedo efficit parietem album, aut Sanitas hominem sanum; sed efficienter, sicut Linitio efficit parientem album, & Medicatio efficit sanum: sic, vel non dissimili ratione, Fides efficit hominem justum, & justificat.* *Ubi supra lib. 5. c. 4. §. 12.*

I like your Explication which you now make, and I think my labour well bestowed, as being the occasion of it. I perceive all that you mean is this, That the Covenant wherein God doth give Christ, is not of force to make Christ ours until we believe. This who can question, Christ being given to be ours only upon condition of believing? Yet Christ being so conditionally given in the Covenant, upon our believing he is made ours by vertue of the Covenant: so that still I see not but that our be- *Ibid. & 60.* (p. 73.)

Thus *Stapleton* somewhere (I cannot now cite the place) testifyeth of them, saying, *Omnes ad unum Protestantes docent Fidem justificantem esse vivam, & operantem per charitatem, atque alia bona opera.*

2. I grant, That *Amor Concupiscentiæ* is prerequisite; if you will call it so, as I see not but you may, though *Amor Concupiscentiæ* is usually opposed to *Amor Amicitiæ*, and so you speak of it, *p.* 58. And if you speak not of *Amor Complacentiæ*, then neither do I speak against you. For of that do I speak, and had reason (I think) to understand you as speaking of it, because you spake of Love as distinct from Desire. Perhaps you speak of it only in respect of its Generical Nature, abstracting from the consideration of either Desire or Complacency, which are the Species of it: but surely these two taking up the whole nature of Love, that Love which is not the one of these, must needs be the other. We accept or chuse a thing, because we first Love, *i. e.* desire it, or (as we use to say) have a mind to it: and having accepted and chosen it, we further love it, so as to delight in it, except our Love turn into Hatred, as *Amnon*'s unchast Love did: but the very Accepting or Chusing of a thing is not (that I see) properly a Loving of it.

3. I grant, that all Love doth not presuppose Acceptance, Consent, *&c.* the Love of Desire doth not; but the Love of Complacency doth. This is all that I have desired, and so much you have yeelded.

Ibid. 1. The distinction of *Fides quæ*, and *Fides quâ*, as it is frequently used by our Learned Writers, so it doth hold good notwithstanding any thing you have said, or (I suppose) can say against it.

Disp. de Fide Just. §. 16. *Quamvis hanc controversiam elevent*, (saith *Rivet*, speaking of the Remonstrants) *nec ciccum (ut loquuntur) interdiunt, an Fides quæ est viva, an Fides quâ est viva, ad justificationem requiratur, & Logicam tantùm pugnam esse velint, Logica tamen hæc pugna realem continet magni momenti. Siquis enim dicat, Christus qui homo est infinitus, & Christus quâ homo est infinitus, nemo sanus existimabit nihil differre has enuntiationes.*

I grant you more than you require, That not only Christ as Lord, but even the whole Word of God is the Object of Justifying Faith; but not therefore of Faith as Justifying. The Hand may receive both Meat and Mony, yet

yet it doth not enrich, as it receiveth Meat, nor feed as it receiveth Mony.

2. If Christ's Satisfaction be our Righteousness, (which I think you have ever affirmed, though you would also have another Righteousness of our own, and that unto Justification;) then I see not but that I may speak of Faith laying hold on and apprehending Christ's Satisfaction. For though the Satisfaction was made unto God, yet it was made for us; and in that respect we are to lay hold on it, and receive it, and not only to assent to the truth of it.

You somewhere cite *Bellarmine* yeelding unto us thus much, *Imputari nobis Christi merita, quia nobis donata sunt, & possumus ea Deo Patri offerre pro peccatis nostris, quoniam Christus suscepit super se onus satisfaciendi pro nobis, nosque Deo Patri reconciliandi.*

Which words also *Amesius* doth cite, and interpret to be as much as if he did say, *Christi merita sunt nobis à Deo donata, ut possimus ea pro nobis Deo offerre tanquam Satisfactionem pro peccatis nostris.* *Contra Bellar. Tom. 4. l. 6. c. 1. §. 22.*

It is *Satisfactio Christi*, though by Faith it becomes *Nostra*, which we must *offerre Deo*: but first we must by Faith receive it, before we can have any interest in it, to make such use of it. Faith justifieth (I grant) as a Condition, because it is required of us, that we may be partakers of Christ's Righteousness; but it is not Faith properly, but the Righteousness of Christ by which we are justified. (p. 72.)

Recte Contarenus (saith *Ames.*) *in Tract. de Justif. Fide justificamur, non formaliter, sicut Albedo efficit parietem album, aut Sanitas hominem sanum; sed efficienter, sicut Linitio efficit parietem album, & Medicatio efficit sanum: sic, vel non dissimili ratione, Fides efficit hominem justum, & justificat.* *Ubi supra lib. 5. c. 4. §. 12.*

I like your Explication which you now make, and I think my labour well bestowed, as being the occasion of it. I perceive all that you mean is this, That the Covenant wherein God doth give Christ, is not of force to make Christ ours until we believe. This who can question, Christ being given to be ours only upon condition of believing? Yet Christ being so conditionally given in the Covenant, upon our believing he is made ours by vertue of the Covenant: so that still I see not but that our believing *Ibid. & 60.* (p. 73.)

lieving doth immediately make Christ ours, there being nothing more to that end required of us, but to believe. But how will it follow, that God doth justifie Men before they believe, when by his Covenant he doth not justifie but upon condition of Believing? The Grant of a thing being Conditional, it cannot be actually obtained until the Condition be performed, though upon the performance of the Condition by vertue of the Grant there be actual enjoyment.

6. (p. 73.) Whether the receiving of Christ as Priest, and the receiving of him as King be two distinct acts, doth little concern our purpose; yet I think the Acts may be distinct, though I deny not but Christ may be received at once in both respects: yet if he be, it is the receiving of him as Priest, not as King, that doth justifie. I grant that the receiving of Christ in respect of any one Office doth virtually include the receiving of him in respect of all his Offices: and he that doth not so receive Christ in respect of his Priestly Office, as to be ready to receive him also in respect of his Kingly Office, when Christ shall so be set forth unto him, doth not at all receive him: such a Faith is a false Faith, and cannot justifie. Yet may there be a receiving of Christ as Priest without an express and direct receiving of him as King, though implicitly and by consequence he be received as such. Neither is it a false Knowledg, though it be an imperfect Knowledg to know Christ as a Priest, and not to know him as a King. And that Christ is sometimes propounded only as a Priest, *i. e.* with express mention only of his Priestly Office, seems clear and undeniable by divers places of Scripture; see *John* 1. 29, 36. and 3. 14, 15. and so other places which speak of Christ as suffering for us, not mentioning his Sovereignty over us, though that is there implied and expressed in other places. And though he be (as sometimes he is) expressly set forth at once both as Priest and King, and so must expressly be received at once in both respects; yet it hinders not, but that the receiving of Christ as Priest, and not the receiving of him as King, is that which justifieth. One may at once receive divers things, and yet those things not all serve for one and the same use, but one thing may serve for one use, and another thing for another use, all being, though in several respects, useful and necessary to be received.

You

You say that you are of my mind in all this, yet you seem to differ from me, in that you make Affiance a Fruit of Acceptance, which you make the very Act of Faith by which we are justified; whereas I taking Affiance for Recumbency, and for that which is meant by Believing in Christ, and Embracing him, make it to be the very Justifying Act of Faith. That Believing in Christ doth principally import Assent I cannot see: to Believe indeed doth seem principally to import Assent; but to Believe in, seems principally to import Affiance. *Ibid.* (74.)

Credere in Christum (as *Ferus* saith well) *est certâ, firmâ, & stabili fiduciâ Christum, omniaque ejus bona complecti, eisque toto corde, totâ animâ, totisque viribus inhærere.* *In Joh. 6. 29.*

So *Wotton*; *Quid est in Christum credere? An id solummodo; credere vera esse, quæ Christus loquitur? At quid opus erat Spiritui Sancto tam novum & insolens verbum usurpare, præsertim obscurum etiam, & à vulgi intelligentiâ remotum? Quod rectè & clarè dici potuit,* Χριστῷ πιστεύειν, *id Spiritus Sanctus novo more dicendi,* εἰς Χριστὸν πιστεύειν, *voluit obscurare? Nam hic certè loquendi modus, εἰς Χριστὸν πιστεύειν, totus est à Spiritu Sancto illi proprius, nec ullum è Græcis autorem agnoscit, ne illos quidem LXX Interpretes, qui Hebræa Biblia Græce reddiderunt, à quibus Apostoli & Evangelistæ multa in Scriptis suis, quod ipsum loquendi modum attinet, crebrò mutuentur. Quamobrem plus quàm verisimile videtur Spiritum Sanctum quum novo loquendi more utatur, quem fiduciam significare perspicuum est, aliud quoddam præter communem vocis significationem proponere voluisse.* *De Reconcil. part 1. lib. 2. c. 14.*

I find that *Seneca* doth use the Latin Phrase, *Hunc (inquit) Deum quis colet? quis credet in eum?* Where [*Credet in eum*] is as much as [*fiduciam in eo collocabit*]. And so the Phrase of [*Believing in*] used in the New Testament, seems to import as much as the Phrases of [*Trusting in*] and [*staying on*] used in the Old Testament, as namely, *Isa.* 50. 10. See Mr. *Ball* of Faith, *part* 1. *chap.* 3. *p.* 24, *&c.* *In Ludo de morte Claudii Cæsaris.*

So far as I can judg, your success is not answerable to your desire. But if you did not intend to infer such a conclusion from your earnest seeking the Lord's Direction on your Knees, I know not to what purpose you did speak (61.) (74.)

of it. For if it were only to shew the sincerity of your desire, What is your Cause advantaged, though that be granted, as I know not why any should question it ?

Ibid. What is that which you say is yeelded ? That Faith doth not justifie, as it is the fulfilling of the Condition of the whole Covenant ? Yet you make Justifying-Faith, as such, to be the Condition of the whole Covenant. For you make it to include Obedience : and what doth the Covenant require more than Faith and Obedience ?

2. Of Justification begun, and Justification continued and consummated by sentence at Judgment, I have spoken before, nor is there need here to say any more of it.

Ibid. 1. No doubt the Holy Ghost means as he speaks : But what of that ? Doth he speak so as you interpret him ?

2. Though our Divines in expounding the words of St. *James*, expres themselves diversly, yet they agree in the Matter, *viz.* That Works do not concur with Faith unto Justification.

Of the Coven. *p.* 64. Mr. *Ball* speaking of those words, [Faith is imputed unto Righteousnes] saith, [*This Passage is diversly interpreted by Orthodox Divines, all aiming at the same Truth, and meeting in the Main, being rather several Expressions of the same Truth, than different Interpretations*].

Then he shews three several ways whereby those words are interpreted, which differ as much as those Interpretations which you mention. They that say, That the Apostle speaketh of Justification *coram Deo*, by Works, understand a Working-Faith : They that expound it of Justification *coram Hominibus*, take the meaning to be, That by Works a Man doth appear to be justified. They that understand it of the Justification of the Person, make the sense the same with those first mentioned : and they that say it is meant of the Justification of a Man's Faith, agree with those in the second place, making Works to prove the sincerity of Faith, and so to manifest a Man's Justification.

3. Are not those words [*Hoc est Corpus meum*] as expres words of Scripture, as those which you alledg ? Though words be never so expres, yet not only τὸ ῥῆτον, but also ἡ διάνοια is to be considered.

4. *James* might well and solidly prove by Works done many

many years after, that the Faith of *Abraham*, whereby he was justified, was a Working-Faith, of a Working Nature, a Faith fruitful in good Works, his Faith bringing forth such fruit in due season, and so shewing it self by Works when occasion did require. *Abraham* (no doubt) had many other Works, whereby his Faith did appear, yet the Apostle thought meet to instance in that Work, which was most remarkable; and by which his Faith did manifest it self in a more especial manner.

Hoc facinus (saith *Chrysostome*) *tanto præstantius erat cæteris omnibus, ut illa cum hoc collata nihil esse viderentur.* In 2 Cor. 1 Hom. 3.

What your Parenthesis doth mean (*Legal Justification I mean*) I do not well understand. But how doth *James* speak of Justification as Continued, and not as Begun? Is his meaning this, That a Man is indeed at first justified by Faith only, but both Faith and Works together do continue his Justification? So you understand it: but surely *James* doth neither speak, nor mean so. For by Faith alone without Works, in his sense, a Man never was, never can be justified. This is clear by his whole Discourse, for he calls him a vain Man that relies on such a Faith, and calls it a *dead Faith*, &c. So that when a Man is first justified, it is by a Working Faith: not that Faith must necessarily produce Works at the first, but it is (as I said) of a Working Nature, of such a Nature as to produce Works when they are required; which is the same with what you say out of *Grotius*: and this doth answer all that you object against the Interpretation which I stand for. Who can doubt but *Abraham* was justified long before he offered up *Isaac*, the Scripture being express for it? But how then? Therefore this Work could be no Condition of that Justification which was past.

Answ. No indeed, that Work was not, nor could be; but Faith apt to shew it self by that Work, or any other, when required, and consequently a Working Faith might be, and was the Condition of that Justification. *Grotius*, whom you cite, giving you such a hint of it, I wonder that you could not observe this. *James* and *Paul* may well enough be reconciled, though both of them speak of Justification as Begun. For *James* doth not require Works otherwise than as Fruits of Faith, to be

brought forth in time convenient: and *Paul* doth not exclude Works in that sense.

Of Justifying-Faith, §. 2. chap. 17. [*Every observant Reader* (saith Dr. *Jackson*) *may furnish himself with plenty of Arguments all demonstrative, that Works taken as St.* James *meant, not for the Act or Operation only, but either for the Act, or promptitude to it, are necessary to Justification*, &c.]

Ibid. And again, [*Faith virtually includes the same mind in us that was in Christ, a readiness to do Works of every kind, which notwithstanding are not Associates of Faith in the business of Justification*].

Ibid. And thus he reconcileth the two Apostles, who in this Point seem to differ, [*St.* James *affirming we are justified by Works, and not by Faith only, speaks of the Passive Qualification in the Subject, or Party to be justified, or made capable of absolute Approbation, or final Absolution. This qualification supposed, St.* Paul *speaks of the Application of the Sentence, or of the ground of the Plea for Absolution: the one* (*by his Doctrine*) *must be conceived, and the other sought for only by Faith. The immediate and only cause of both he still contends not to be in us, but without us: and for this reason, when he affirms that we are justified by Faith alone, he considers not Faith as it is a part of our qualification inherent, or the foundation of other Graces, but as it includes the Correlative Term, or Immediate Cause of Justification, whereunto it alone hath peculiar reference, and continual aspect. This is that which in other terms some have delivered,* Fides justificat relative, non * effective, aut formaliter, &c.]

* *Not that Faith hath no efficiency at all in Justifying, but that it is not the Meritorious Cause of Justification.*

Take a few words more from this Author, (*Ibid.*) [*The Apostle levels his whole Discourse to this Point maintained by us, That seeing Righteousness was imputed to* Abraham *by Faith, and not through Works, none after him should in this life at any time,* (*N. B.*) *whether before or after the infusion of Grace, or Inherent Righteousness, presume to seek or hope for like approbation from God otherwise than only by Faith*].

How

How I exclude Love, I have shewed, even as you do, *viz.* Love of Complacency, which you grant doth follow Acceptance, that Act of Faith by which we are justified. And when I say that Protestants generally deny Faith, which is without Works to justifie, I mean Faith which is without works when God doth call for them. You might easily have perceived this to be my meaning by what I said out of *Cajetan de fide non sterili, sed fœcunda operibus.* A Tree is not said to be barren, except it doth not bring forth Fruit when the Season doth require.

5. I shewed you what I take to be meant *Jam.* 2. 23. when it is said, [*And the Scripture was fulfilled, which saith,* Abraham *believed God, and it was imputed to him for Righteousness*]; *viz.* That by *Abraham*'s readiness to obey God in offering up *Isaac*, the truth of that Scripture did clearly appear, it was then most manifest, That *Abraham* believed God indeed, and that his Faith was a true Justifying-Faith, it being operative, and shewing forth it self so evidently by Works of Obedience, when they were required of him; so that the Scripture did well and truly say of him, That he *believed God, and it was accounted to him for Righteousness.*

Cajetan doth explicate it (me-thinks) very well. *Adverte* (saith he) *prudens Lector, quòd* Jacobus *non sentit fidem absque operibus mortuam esse, &c. Sed sentit fidem sine operibus, id est, renuentem operari, esse mortuam, esse vanam, & non justificantem. Et rectè sentit, quoniam, quæ non est parata operari, mortua est. Suâpte enim naturâ operatur per dilectionem, ut* Paulus *dicit.* Quod ergo Jacobus *affert verba,* Gen. 15. [*Credidit* Abraham *Deo, &c.*] *ad hoc affert, quod credidit paratus operari. Et propterea dicit, quod in opere oblationis filii impleta est Scriptura loquens de fide* Abrahæ *parata operari. Impleta, inquam, est quoad executionem maximi operis, ad quod parata erit fides* Abrahæ. *In Loc.*

And though you make light of this interpretation of *James*, as if it were nothing against you; yet *Calvin* doubted not to say, *Nodo insolubili constrictos teneo, quicunque justitiam* Abrahæ *coram Deo imputatam fingunt, quia immolavit filium* Isaac, *qui nondum natus erat, quum Spiritus Sanctus pronunciat justum fuisse* Abraham. *Itaque necessario restat, ut aliquid posterius notari* *In Loc.*

tari discamus. Quomodo igitur Jacobus *id fuisse impletum dicit? Nempe ostendere vult, qualis illa fuerit fides, quæ justificavit* Abraham, *non otiosa scilicet, aut evanida, sed quæ illum Deo reddidit obsequentem; sicut etiam* Heb. 11. 8. *habetur.*

* He is express against it. *Instit. l. 3. c. 17. §. 9.* Of the Coven. *c. 12. 79, 80*

Calvin (it seems) never dreamed of being justified one way at first, * and another way afterwards. I would not have you put him off with a taunt, as you did before. *Parcius ista tamen, &c.*

But let Mr. *Blake* also be heard speak, [James *indeed* (saith he) *saith that* Abraham *was justified by Works, when he had offered* Isaac *his Son on the Altar,* Jam. 2. 21. *But either there we must understand a Working-Faith with* Piscator, Pareus, Pemble, *&c. and confess that* Paul *and* James *handle two distinct Questions, the one, Whether Faith alone justifies without Works? which he concludes in the Affirmative. The other, What Faith justifies, whether a Working-Faith only, and not a Faith that is dead & idle? Or else I know not how to make sense of the Apostle, who straight infers from* Abraham's *Justification by the offer of his Son; And the Scripture was fulfilled, that saith,* Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for Righteousness. *How otherwise do these accord? He was justified by Works, and the Scripture was fulfilled, that saith, He was justified by Faith? Neither can I reconcile what he saith, if this be denied, with the whole current of the Gospel*].

And he adds a little after, [*All Works before or after Conversion, are inherent in us, or wrought by us, are excluded from Justification*].

Your Interpretations, *viz.* [*Abraham believed,* i. e. *believed and obeyed*]. Or, [*Yet the Scripture was fulfilled,* &c. *For Faith did justifie him, but not only Faith*]. are so uncouth and incongruous, that I wonder how you could perswade your self, much more think to perswade others to embrace them. *Paul* cites those words to prove that *Abraham* was justified only by Believing, and that Justification is by Faith only: And shall we admit of such an interpretation, [*Faith doth justifie, but not only?*] Or [*Abraham was justified by Believing and Obeying?*] What is this else but to make the Scripture a nose of wax, and to wrest it which way we please? Yea; What is it else but to make the Scripture plainly to contradict it self?

self? And yet (forsooth) you pretend to stand upon the το ῥητὸν, and the plain words of Scripture. But *Paul* (you say) speaks of Justification as Begun; and that (you grant) is by Faith only? Well, and for proof of his Doctrine (say I) he alledgeth the words of *Moses* concerning *Abraham*. Must not those words then be understood of the same Justification? Will you say with *Bellarmine*, that *Paul* speaking of the first Justification, doth fetch a proof from the second? As on the other side, he saith, that *James*, speaking of the second Justification, doth fetch a proof from the first? This is *Cœlum Terræ miscere, & Mare Cœlo.*

6. For my interpretation of *Jam.* 2. 22. I did not only affirm it to be so, but also shewed where the same phrase is so used, *viz.* 2 Cor. 12. 9. And I find that Orthodox Writers do parallel those places, and interpret the one by the other.

Thus *Camero*; *Fides* (*inquit*) *dicitur perfici operibus, quia Fides, dum producit opera, ostendit quàm sit perfecta: ut* 2 Cor. 12. 9. *Virtus Christi dicitur perfici in infirmitatibus, quia tum scilicet se maximè exerit, & prodit.* *Myroth. ad Jac. 2. 22.*

And so *Maccovius*; *Fides fuit perfecta ex operibus, quomodo virtus Christi perficitur in infirmitate,* 2 Cor. 12. 9. *quia in eâ se exerit: consimili ratione Fides perfici per opera dicitur, quia per ea se prodit.* *De Justif. Disp. 10.*

Generally I find the words thus expounded by those that either comment upon them, or have occasion to treat of them.

Dicitur ex operibus (saith *Calvin*) *fuisse perfecta, non quòd inde suam perfectionem accipiat, sed quòd vera esse inde comprobetur.* *In Loc.*

So *Beza*; *Hoc igitur* (*inquit*) *ad declarationem quoque pertinet. Fides enim eo perfectior dicitur, quo plenius perspecta est, ac cognita, & quo efficacius vires suas exerit quæ prius non ita apparebant.* *In Loc.* *Perfecta, i. e. perfectius cognita.*

Fulke doth cite *Beda* thus expounding it; [*His Faith was perfected by his Deeds, that is, by perfect execution of Works it was proved to be in his Heart*]. Tremell. *ad Loc.*

Thus also *Lud. de Dieu*, *Quatenus bona opera vitam fidei, ejusque vim, efficaciam, sinceritatem produnt, adeoque eam illustrant & exornant, rectè dicuntur perfectio Fidei.* *In Loc.*

And

Symphon. Cathol. Cap. 36. Thesi 2.

And so *Polanus*; *Fides justificans perficitur ex bonis operibus, non quoad esse seu essentiam & constitutionem suam, sed quatenus per ea firmatur, manifestatur, comprobatur; sicut res aliqua tum fieri dicitur, quum patefit.*

Fides dicitur perfici per opera, quia per ea se prodit Rivet. *Disp. de Fide Justif. §. 20.*

And he cites the Interlineary Gloss upon *Jam. 2. Per opera fides est augmentata & comprobata.*

And *Lyra*; *Et ex operibus fides consummata est. Habitus enim firmatur & manifestatur per opera. Et similiter magnitudo fidei* Abrahæ *apparuit ex ejus obedientia offerendo filium, propter quod dictum fuit sibi à Domino; Nunc cognovi, &c.*

Of Faith, Part 1. c. 4. p. 44.

Thus also Mr. *Ball*, [*Faith is perfected by Works, not that the Nature of Faith receiveth complement or perfection from Works, but because it doth declare and manifest it self by Love and good Works, and is esteemed so much the more perfect, as the Works produced are the more excellent*].

Animad. pag. 54. *Where I also cited Dr* Preston *thus expounding it, and using this similitude to illustrate it.*

To illustrate this, I used also the Similitude of a Tree, the goodness of whose Fruit doth but manifest the goodness of it; and so the power of Faith doth but appear by its fruits, *viz.* Works. You say that Faith is really perfected by Works, as a Tree is by bearing fruit. But (as our Saviour saith) *a Tree is known by his Fruit.* The Fruit doth not make the Tree good, but only shew it to be so. And this very Similitude have Learned Divines used to this purpose.

Beza immediately after the words before cited adds, *Ut si dicatur alicujus arboris bonitas tum fuisse perfecta, quum optimum aliquem fructum edidit. Nam quia de causa judicamus ex effectis, videtur quodammodo causa vis vel minui, vel augeri ex effectorum proportione. Sed hoc ex effectis intelligitur quidem, & æstimatur, non autem emanat.*

Ubi supra.

So Mr. *Ball*, [*How then saith the Apostle that Faith is perfected by Works? As we judg of the Cause by the Effects, and by the proportion of the Effects the efficacy and force of the Cause may seem to be increased or diminished. Every thing is acknowledged to be perfect, when it worketh, and is esteemed so much the more perfect, by how much the more it worketh: As we say the goodness of a Tree is perfect, when it hath brought forth some excellent good Fruit. Thus Philosophers teach, That the Form*

Form is not perfect, when it is considered as the first Act, but when it is taken as the second Act; for by working it putteth forth its force, and declareth it self. And so Faith is perfected by Works, &c.] as before cited.

You say also, That Faith is really perfected by Works, as a Covenant or Promise is by Performance. But the Performance doth only manifest the perfection of a Covenant or Promise. It is a perfect Covenant or Promise, as soon as it is made, if it be made sincerely and without guile, though it appears more fully to be so when it is performed. Again you say, That Faith is really perfected by Works, as it hath *naturam medii, viz.* Conditionis, to the Continuation and Consummation of Justification. But you have not yet proved, That there is any other Condition of Justification as Continued and Consummated, than of Justification as Begun.

Apprehensio illa fidei habet fluxum suum continuum, &c. (saith *Rivet*) *Quod continuum beneficium fide apprehensum, si secundam Justificationem appellare velint adversarii, imò tertiam, quartam, quintam, & millesimam, non repugnamus, dummodo constet nullâ aliâ ratione (N. B.) nos justificari à peccatis sequentibus, quàm eâ, quâ semel justificati fuimus à precedentibus.* *In Gen. 15 Exercit. 73.*

St. *James* doth not speak of Works perfecting Faith more to the continuing and consummating of Justification, than to the beginning of it. For (which must ever be remembred) he speaks of Faith as *apta nata operari:* and such a Faith is requisite, that we may be justified as well at first as afterward. Otherwise Works neither at first nor afterward do concur with Faith to our Justification.

[*A preparation or promptitude of Heart* (saith Mr. *Ball*) *to good Works, is an effect of Faith as immediate as Justification*]. Of Faith, Part 1. c. 4. p. 57.

And again, [*Faith doth not begin to apprehend Life, and leave the accomplishment to Works, but doth rest upon the Promise of Life until we come to enjoy it*]. *Ib.* Part 2. c. 4. p. 253.

Yet again you say, That Faith is really perfected by Works, as Works are a part of that necessary Matter (not necessary at the first moment of Believing, but necessary afterward, when we are called to it) whereby we are justified

justified against the Charge of non-performance of the New-Covenants Condition, even against the Charge of being an Unbeliever or an Hypocrite. But all this proves not that Works give any perfection to Faith, but only that they shew the perfection, *i. e.* the sincerity, force, and efficacy of it. Works may manifest a Man to be no Unbeliever or Hypocrite: but it is his Faith, which being unfained, doth indeed make him to be no Unbeliever or Hypocrite. All therefore that you have said, makes nothing against my interpretation of those words, *Jam.* 2. 22. [And by Works was Faith made perfect].

7. Your self deny *necessitatem præsentiæ operum* in respect of our being justified at first. And for the Conducibility of Works to the effect of Justification, *James* speaketh not of it, but only shews, that Justifying Faith is not without Works, *viz.* when God doth call for them. He shews that Justifying-Faith is a Working-Faith, a Faith ready to Work when occasion doth require: But that Works do therefore conduce unto Justification as well as Faith, he doth not shew, neither doth this any way follow upon the other. A Working-Faith is the Condition of Justification, *i. e.* Faith which is of such a nature as to bring forth the Fruit of good Works in due season: yet are we not therefore justified by Works as well as by Faith. For we are justified by Faith only apprehending Christ and his Righteousness; though the same Faith that doth this, will also produce good Works, as *Abraham*'s Faith did. That Works do justifie the Faith, but not the Person, though I use not to speak so, yet I think may be said without any implication of Contradiction. It is true, *Justificatio causæ est etiam Justificatio personæ, non simpliciter & absolutè, sed quoad istam causam:* but they that use that distinction mean (I think) only this, that Works shew Faith to be found and good, yet it is Faith and not Works, by which a Man is simply and absolutely justified. Do not (I pray) here lay hold on the word [*absolutely*]; it is referred to the word [*justified*] not to the word [*Faith*]. I do not say, That Faith absolutely considered doth justifie: no, it doth justifie as it is considered relatively; Faith, *i. e.* Christ apprehended by Faith, is that whereby we are absolutely justified. Though Works may justifie against the Accusation of being a final non-performer of the Condition (so

Fides sola justificat, quia ipsa est unicum instrumentum, & unica facultas, in nobis quâ recipimus justitiam, Christi. Bucan. *Loc.* 31. *ad quæst.* 37.

(so I would say, not Conditions, in respect of the Justification of which we speak) of the New Covenant; yet do they not therefore simply and absolutely justifie, but only against that Accusation, shewing that a Man did perform the Condition, *viz.* believe, and so is simply and absolutely justified, not by Works (which do but only declare him to be so) but by Faith, as the Condition or Instrument (for I will use the terms promiscuously as others do) of Justification. Faith doth not justifie as Working, *i. e.* as bringing forth the Fruit of good Works; your self deny this in respect of our Justification at first: yet Faith doth not justifie, except it be of a Working-Nature, *i. e.* of such a Nature as to work when God calls for it. More than this cannot be inferred from *Jam.* 24. as is clear by the Context.

1. All Works, if good, are Works of the Law, *viz.* the Moral Law, which (as I said in the *Animadversions*) is the eternal Rule of Righteousness. And of that Law the Apostle speaks, when he excludes Works from Justification, as appears by his Reasons which he useth for proof of his Assertion, *Rom.* 3.20. *Gal.* 3.10. 63.

Evangelii (*inquit* Maccovius) *nulla sunt opera bona distincta à Lege formaliter. Adversarii cum urgentur, ex operibus legis non justificari hominem, admittunt hoc, & dicunt, ita quidem esse, sed non proinde non justificari operibus Evangelii. Hinc distinguunt inter opera Legis & Evangelii. Sed si obtineat hac distinctio, tum utique dabuntur etiam peccata, quæ committuntur * in Doctrinam Evangelii: Non ergo erit adæquata definitio peccati, quam dat Spiritus Sanctus,* 1 Joh. 3.4. *quod peccatum sit Legis transgressio.——At Evangelium distinguitur à Lege. Certè; interim Evangelii Doctrina præcipitur Lege. Nam Deus postulat, ut Evangelio credamus, &c.* *Theol.* Part 1. Disp. 16. * *Nempe Solam, & non etiam in Doctrinam Legis.*

So *Pemble*, [*Nor yet* (saith he) *hath this Distinction* (viz. *Works of the Law, and Works of the Gospel*) *any ground in Scripture, or in Reason. For both tell us, That the Works commanded in the Law, and Works commanded in the Gospel, are one and the same for the substance of them. What Work can be named, that is enjoyned us in the New Testament, which is not commanded us in that summary Precept of the Moral Law,* Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy Heart, Of Justif. Sect. 2. Chap. 2. §. 2.

Heart, and with all thy Soul, &c. *What is there against the Gospel, which is not a transgression of the Law?* — *You will say, It doth not command Faith in Christ. I answer, Yea, it doth. For that which commands us in general to believe what-ever God shall propose unto us, commands us also to believe in Christ, as soon as God shall make known that it is his Will we should believe in him. The Gospel discovers to us the Object, the Law commands us the obedience of believing it*].

The Moral Law may be said to be a part of the New Covenant, as it requireth that they which have believed, be careful to maintain good works, *Tit.* 3. 8, 14. and to walk circumspectly (*ἀκριβῶς accuratè, i. e. quam proximè ad Legis Dei præcepta*, as *Beza* doth well expound it), *Ephes.* 5. 15. But this is far, and very far too from proving Works to have a co-interest with Faith in the effect of justifying. For your Reasons why the Apostle doth not exclude all Works absolutely from Justification, I see no strength in them; and therefore I answer;

Ad Loc.

Ad 1. That which you call Justification against the Accusation of final Unbelief, is indeed *Justification* against the Accusation of Transgressing the whole Law. For that Accusation being only made void by Faith, where there is final Unbelief, there that Accusation hath its full force. Besides, though the Accusation of final Unbelief may be proved to be false by Works, yet Works upon this account do no otherwise justifie, than by manifesting a Man's Faith, by which Faith indeed, and not by Works he is justified.

Ad 2. So also that Justification which *James* speaketh of, is against a true Charge, and the same with *Remission* of sins, as well as that which *Paul* doth speak of. For can they that have but a dead *Faith*, be justified against a true Charge and have their sins remitted? Surely it must be a Living and a Working *Faith*, such as *James* doth require, can work that Effect. Justification against a false Accusation, is but such a Justification as the worst of Men and the Devils themselves are capable of.

De Justif. c. 3. §. 11. *Nemo enim iniquus adeò*, (as *Bradshaw* speaketh) *aut injustus dari potest, qui falsò accusari, & consequenter etiam eatenus merito justificari non possit.*

Indeed Justification against the Accusation of final Unbelief, is by consequence a Justification against all Accu-

Accusations, because *Faith* is the Condition and Instrument of Universal Justification. But hence it follows that we are justified universally by *Faith*, and not by *Works*, which are only an Argument *à posteriori* of *Faith*, and so of Justification.

Ad 3. All Works that have a co-interest with *Faith* in Justification, are Competitors with Christ, or Copartners with him; so that Justification must be partly by the Righteousness of Christ through *Faith*, and partly by *Works*.

Ad 4. As the Righteousness of Christ is freely given or imputed at first upon condition of *Faith*, so is the free gift and imputation of it still continued upon the same condition of *Faith*; which *Faith* both when Justification is first begun, and when it is continued, must be a *Working-Faith*, *i. e.* ready to work as occasion doth require. If our Divines affirm, That the Apostle speaking against Justification by Works, means in point of merit, (as you say you could bring multitudes of them to this purpose) surely it is, because they know no other Justification by Works, but that which doth presuppose Works to be meritorious.

Hear one whom I (and so I presume you also) take for a good Divine, *viz.* Mr. *Blake*, [*This Justification* (saith he) *wrought freely by Grace through Faith*, Rom. 3. 24. *is no way consistent with Justification by Works. And what the Apostle speaks of Election, we may well apply to Justification: the same medium equally proves the truth of both; If by Grace, then it is no more of Works, otherwise Grace were no more Grace: But if it be of Works, then it is no more of Grace, otherwise Works were no more Works*, Rom. 11. 6.] Of the Coven. c. 12. p. 80.

Calvin also useth this Argument to confute those who would have Works to concur with *Faith* unto Justification, that then we should have somewhat to boast of, which is not to be admitted. *Sed quoniam* (*inquit*) *bona pars hominum justitiam ex fide & operibus compositam imaginatur, præmonstremus id quoque, sic inter se differre fidei operumque justitiam, ut altera stante necessariò altera evertatur. Dicit Apostolus se omnia pro stercoribus reputasse, ut Christum lucrifaceret, &c.* (Phil. 3. 8, 9.) *Vides & contrariorum esse hîc comparationem, & indicari propriam justitiam oportere pro derelicto haberi* *Instit.* l. 3. c. 11. §. 13.

haberi ab eo, qui velit Christi justitiam obtinere.—Ita ipsum quoque ostendit, cum negat per Legem excludi gloriationem nostram, sed per fidem. Unde sequitur, quantisper manet quantulacunque operum justitia, manere nobis nonnullam gloriandi materiam. Jam si fides omnem gloriationem excludit, cum justitiâ fidei sociari nullo pacto justitia operum potest. In hunc sensum tam clarè loquitur quarto cap. ad Rom. *ut nullum cavillis aut tergiversationibus locum relinquat. Si operibus, inquit, justificatus est* Abraham, *habet gloriam. Subjungit, atque non habet gloriam apud Deum. Consequens ergo est, non justificatum esse operibus. Ponit deinde alterum argumentum à contrariis. Quum rependitur operibus merces, id fit ex debito, non ex gratiâ. Fidei autem tribuitur justitia secundum gratiam. Ergo id non est ex meritis operum. Valeat igitur eorum somnium, (N.B.) qui justitiam ex fide & operibus conflatam comminiscuntur.*

Who those multitudes of Divines be of whom you speak, I cannot tell, because you name none; but I think that few or none of them will be found of your mind, *viz.* That *Paul* doth only exclude Works from Justification in point of merit; as if Justification might be by Works in some other respect, so as that no merit thereby is presupposed. So far as I observe, our Divines note this as one main Argument, whereby the Apostle doth wholly exclude Works from Justification, because otherwise the merit of Works could not be denied, which yet is to be exploded.

Cent. I. *lib.* 2. *c.* 4. *Col.* 257. *Arg.* 26. Thus the *Centuristæ* among many other Arguments, whereby the Apostles (they say) prove Justification to be by *Faith* alone, note this for one; *Non est gloriandum in nobis, sed in Domino. Ergo non ex operibus, sed gratis justificamur, ne quis glorietur,* Ephes. 2. 1 Cor. 1.

Ad 5. All good Works (as I have shewed before) and consequently those whereby we perform obedience to the Redeemer, are works of the Law, it being the Rule to which they must be conformed. But it is *Faith* in the Redeemer, not Obedience to the Redeemer, by which we are justified, though *Justifying-Faith* must, and will shew it self by Obedience.

Ad 6. All Works that have an agency in Justification, are meritorious, and so make the Reward to be of Debt,

and

and not of Grace. Now to your Answers to my Arguments in *oppositum* I reply; And for the first thus; If *Abraham*'s Gospel-Works did justifie him otherwise than by evidencing his Faith, whereby he was justified, if they be made to have a co-interest with Faith in his Justification, then they are set in Competition or Copartnership with Christ's Righteousness.

That no Work of the Gospel doth justifie; Mr. *Pemble* proveth by this, That every Work of the Gospel, is a Work of the Law also; and therefore the Apostle denying that a Man is justified by the Works of the Law, doth consequently deny that he is justified by the Works of the Gospel. That Works do justifie as Conditions under Christ, is repugnant to what your self hold in respect of Justification as begun: and I see not, that the Scripture shews us any other Condition of Justification afterward than at first. Of Justif. §. 2. ch. 2. §. 2. See *Rivet* as cited pag. 145.

2. My Conclusion, That *Abraham* was not justified by Works, but by Faith, is not against *Jam.* 2. 21. no more than *Paul*'s Doctrine *Rom.* 3. & 4. is. For I mean, as *Paul* doth, That *Abraham*'s Works did not concur with his Faith to his Justification: but *James* meant only, That *Abraham*'s Faith was not such as some presume of a dead idle Faith, but a living working Faith; and that his Works did manifest his Faith to be such as whereby he was justified.

Cum obtulisset (*inquit* Bucanus) Abraham Isaac *filium suum super altare, ex operibus justificatus est, hoc est, compertus est fuisse justificatus per fidem, idque ex operibus tanquam testimonijs Justificationis. Et sic homo operibus justificatur, id est, comprobatur esse illa persona, quæ Christi obedientiâ justificatur, ex vitæ sanctificatione quæ tanquam effectus illam sequitur, & de illa testatur. Quomodo etiam Deus dicitur in extremo illo die justificaturus electos suos ex ipsorum operibus. Nam sunt duo principia, unum existentia, alterum cognitionis. Ita fides principium existentiæ facit, ut simus justi. Opera autem ut principium cognitionis faciunt, ut cognoscamur justi. Ideo Dominus in extremo die proponet principium cognitionis justitiæ fidei, quod incurret in oculos omnium creaturarum*, Mat. 25. *Venite benedicti*, &c. *Loc. Com. Loc.* 31. *ad quæst.* 39.

For the second; 1. The Apostle *Rom.* 4. 4. speaketh without any distinction, *To him that worketh*, &c. Now (as you know) *non est distinguendum, ubi lex non distinguit.*

2. If Works justifie, then they must be meritorious. The Apostle doth not simply deny a Reward to belong of Grace to him that worketh, but to him that worketh so as to be justified by his Works. Such an one having no need of remission of sins, because his Works do justifie him, (which they cannot do if they be imperfect, and so he need pardon) he is said to receive the Reward, not of Grace, but of Debt.

* *Fides non justificat quatenus est opus justitiæ, sed quatenus apprehendit justitiam Christi.* Rivet. *Disput. de Fide Justif.* Sect. 19.

3. Faith as a * Work is excluded from Justification, only it justifieth as an Instrument or Hand receiving Christ and his Righteousnes. Or (which is to the same effect) Faith doth not justifie, as it is a Duty, which if we perform not we sin; but as a Condition upon which the Righteousnes of Christ is imputed unto us for our Justification. You are not to be blamed for making use of *Bellarmine's* Argument, (for so indeed it is, not his Answer) but for not taking notice how our Divines do answer it. See *Amesius contra. Bellar. tom.* 4. *lib.* 5. *cap.* 4. *ad* 6. Love, Hope, and Obedience are not Instruments of receiving Christ, as Faith is; neither doth the Scripture make them Conditions of Justification, as it doth Faith.

Fides sola justificat, quia ipsa est unicum instrumentum, & unica facultas in nobis, quâ recipimus justitiam Christi. Bucan. *Loc.* 31. *ad quæst.* 37.

For the Third; 1. Neither doth *James* speak of any other Justification.

2. The imperfection of *Faith* proves that none are justified by it, as a Work or Duty, but only as apprehending Christ and his Righteousnes; See *Calv. Instit. lib.* 3. *cap.* 11. §. 7. And *Pemble* of *Justif. Sect.* 2. *chap.* 2 *pag.* 38.

3. No more do the greatest Transgressors need pardon for that wherein they do not transgress.

4. Works

4. Works as Works either justifie by way of merit, or not at all: But *Faith* doth not justifie as a Work or Duty required of us, but as an Instrument receiving Christ, or (if you will) a Condition whereby we are made partakers of Christ's Righteousness, by which we are justified; See *Pemble* of *Justif.* §. 2. *chap.* 1. *pag.* 24.

The Exclusion (*viz.* of VVorks from being concurrent with Faith unto Justification) is not only Mr. *Pemble*'s, but generally all Protestants, and indeed *Paul*'s and the Scriptures: and to take in VVorks (in that sense) is as Mr. *Blake* before cited truly saith, against the whole current of the Gospel. 64.

1. To deny the Scripture to mean as you interpret it, is not to deny it to mean as it speaketh. Whether the Reasons which I alledged against your interpretation of St. *James* be forced, let others judg. *Ibid.* & 65.

2. It avails your cause nothing to prove, That *James* by working doth mean VVorks indeed. I presume Mr. *Pemble* would not deny that, but his meaning (I conceive) was, That VVorks are only spoken of as Fruits of Justifying *Faith*, and are only said to justifie, because they are (as Dr. *Jackson* speaketh) a passive qualification in the Subject or Party to be justified.

[*Hence* (saith he also) *is the seeming inconvenience of St.* James *his Causal form of Speech* (ἐξ ἔργων δικαιοῦται καὶ οὐ ἐκ πίστεως) *easily answered. For the immediate and principal cause proposed, it is usual to attribute a kind of causality to the qualification of the Subject, though only requisite as a mere passive disposition, without which the principal or sole Agent shall want his efficacy*]. Of Justifying Faith, §. 2. *ch.* 17. §. 7.

All that St. *James* intended is this, That Justifying *Faith* is of a VVorking-Nature, and not such a *Faith* as some rely on, *viz.* barren and without VVorks. Now for your Reasons, I answer, *Ad* 1. You speak of the unprofitableness of bare *Faith*, *i. e.* (say you) Assent. But *quorsum hoc?* You know that Protestants make *Faith* to justifie, not as it is a bare Assent, but as it is a Receiving of Christ, and a Recumbency on him.

Fides hæc justificans (saith *Amesius*) *non est illa generalis, quâ in intellectu assensum præbemus veritati in Sacris literis revelatæ, &c. Fides igitur illa propriè dicitur justificans, quâ incumbimus in Christum ad remissionem* *Medull. lib.* 1. *c.* 27. §. 15, 16.

peccatorum, & salutem. And this *Faith* they hold is not barren; but fruitful in good VVorks; though not VVorks, but *Faith* it self (apprehending and applying Christ) be it, whereby we are justified.

Disp. de Fide Just. §. 18, 19, 20, 21, 22. *Id fidei exclusivè tribuendum ex eo constat, quod sola est fides, quæ Deo promittenti credit, quæ sola acquiescit in gratuitâ promissione Dei in Christo, & remissionem peccatorum apprehendit, &c. Unde etiam sequitur, Fidem non justificare, quatenus est opus justitiæ, sed quatenus apprehendit justitiam Christi, &c. Nec* Jacobus *dissentit à* Paulo, *quamvis alio modo loquendi utatur, ut redarguat eos, qui seipsos fallebant inani fidei justificationem tribuentes, quam probat non esse veram ab exemplo Charitatis, quæ nullam vim habet, si tota sit in verbis,* c. 2. 16. *Operibus autem justificari apud* Jacobum, *idem est, quod apud* Paulum; 1 *Tim.* 3. 16. *justificari spiritu, i.e. Vi spiritus dare sui experimentum, quomodo experimentum dedit* Abraham *fidei suæ, offerendo filium suum: & homo probatus fit,* δόκιμος, *tentatione,* Jac. 1. 12. *quæ probatio non facit ut res sit, sed per experientiam docet rem esse. Unde etiam fides dicitur perfici per opera, quia per ea se prodit. Ergo cum* Paulo *vult* Jacobus, *hominem justificari fide, sed uterque eâ, quæ sui experimentum dat per opera: etsi neuter vult opera esse justificationis causas, aut ad justitiam coram Deo acceptari, quorum primum volunt Pontificii, alterum Sociniani & Remonstrantes. Concludimus cum Apostolo, & colligimus, fide justificari hominem absque operibus Legis,* Rom. 3. 28. *sub quibus comprehendimus quælibet opera, quæ secundum Legem fiunt, etiam à sanctis & fidelibus. Cum enim inter Legem factorum sive operum, & Legem fidei distinguat Apostolus, ibid.* v. 27. *si ex operibus justificemur, Legis operum & fidei distinctio erit vana, & Argumentum ex eâ deductum pro fidei justificatione nutabit; quod absurdum ut vitemus, scientes non justificari hominem ex operibus Legis, sed tantum per fidem Jesu Christi; etiam nos in Jesum Christum credimus, ut justificemur ex fide Jesu Christi, non ex operibus Legis,* Gal. 2. 22. *Sed cum eodem Apostolo fidum esse hunc sermonem affirmamus studendum esse iis, qui crediderunt Deo, ut bona opera tueantur,* Tit. 3. 8. *ut purificemus nos ab omni inquinamento, &c.* 2 Cor. 7. 1. *quod cum fiat de die in diem,* 2 Cor. 4. 16. *quam-*

d. à

dix caro concupiscit adversus Spiritum, &c. Gal. 5. 17. *in eo non possumus coram Deo justificari. Nam in justificando partialem justitiam Deus non respicit, sed perfectam & plenam, quia Lex maledicit omnibus, qui non permanebunt in omnibus quæ præcipit,* Deut. 27. 26. Gal. 3. 10.

I have been the larger in citing this Author, both because he is eminent, and also doth speak so fully to the Point, and doth meet with many of your Opinions.

But to proceed, It is *Faith* and *Faith*, *i. e.* several kinds of *Faith*, which St. *James* opposeth one to the other, *viz.* *Faith* which is a bare Assent, and without Works, such a *Faith* as the Devils have, and *Faith* which is moreover an embracing of Christ, and the mercy of God in Christ, and is attended with VVorks as the Fruits and Effects of it, as the *Faith* of *Abraham* and *Rahab* was. Though therefore he concludes, That *Faith* cannot save him that hath not VVorks, yet it follows not that VVorks concur with *Faith* unto Justification, but only that a Justifying *Faith* will shew it self by VVorks.

Ad 2. It is granted, That *Faith* which is no more than a bare Assent, is neither Justifying nor Saving: But what of this? Is there no other *Faith* than Assent? Do not you your self make Acceptance, which is more than Assent, the compleating Act of Justifying *Faith*? And how can you say, That there is the same force ascribed to VVorks as to *Faith*, when you make Justification at first to be by *Faith* without VVorks? Indeed VVorks are requisite in their place, but not as having the like force with *Faith* unto Justification, (shew any Orthodox VVriter that doth hold so) though as necessary Fruits of that *Faith*, by which we are justified. Say not that you speak of Justification as continued, for VVorks, as St. *James* doth speak of them, are as necessary unto Justification at first as afterward, *viz.* a promptitude and readiness to do good VVorks: if this be wanting, it is no Justifying *Faith*, but (as St. *James* calls it) *a dead Faith*, altogether vain and unprofitable.

Ad 3. That *Faith* without VVorks is a hardening of Unbelievers, I grant: *sed quid tum postea?* Do therefore VVorks justifie as well as *Faith*? But I do not think that St. *James* brings in (*chap.* 2. 18.) an Unbeliever so speaking. For how should an Unbeliever (a profes-

sed Unbeliever, we mean; for you use to distinguish betwixt an Unbeliever and an Hypocrite) speak of his *Faith*, saying, [*And I will shew thee my Faith*?]

In Loc. *Calvin* doth far better interpret it, saying, *Jacobus dicit, promptum fore piis sanctè viventibus, excutere hypocritis talem jactantiam, quâ inflati sunt.*

Ad 4. The Devils have a true Belief, *i. e.* a true Assent; but there is more than Assent in justifying *Faith*, even that *Faith* whereby we are justified at first, as your self do hold. And you confess also that *Faith* doth justifie at first without VVorks; yet (say I) not except it be of a VVorking-Nature, *i. e.* ready to VVork, when VVorks are required: and otherwise than as Fruits of Justifying *Faith* VVorks do not justifie neither at first nor afterward.

Ad 5. Faith without VVorks is dead, as to the effect of Justification, even altogether unprofitable, *i. e.* Faith *venuens operari*, or which is not *parata operari*, as *Cajetan* doth well express it. But this is nothing to prove a *In Jac. 2.* Co-interest of VVorks with *Faith* in point of Justification; it only proves, That Justifying *Faith* is of a working Nature. VVhereas you add, [*Still here the opposite part on one side is Faith and Works, and on the other side Faith without Works*]; this doth nothing hinder, but that the opposition is (as I said) betwixt *Faith* and *Faith*, *i. e.* several kinds of *Faith*, whereof the one is accompanied with VVorks, and the other not; the one is operative and fruitful, the other idle & barren. That *Abraham* was justified not only by that *Faith* that did work, but also by VVorks, is more than St. *James* doth say, and is directly contradictory to what St. *Paul* saith. Indeed it is more than you can say, without your distinction of Justification Begun and Continued; which distinction St. *James* never thought of. For surely Justification cannot be at first by a dead and unprofitable Faith, as he affirms that to be, which is without VVorks. That in *Jam.* 2. 22. cannot be meant that Faith by VVorks is made perfect, as accomplishing its ends, but only as thereby declared and manifested to be perfect. The end of Faith is to justifie; and your self say, That Faith at first doth justifie without Works: so that in your Opinion Faith without VVorks is perfect, accomplishing its end in justifying at first. But in St. *James* his sense Faith doth not, cannot

at

at all justifie without VVorks, *i. e.* if it be not ready to work: and in that respect VVorks do perfect Faith, *i. e.* they make the perfection of Faith to appear: but of that enough before.

Ad 6. And so of that also in *Jam.* 2. 23. enough hath been said already. That Faith alone is the Condition of the Initiation; but Faith and Obedience of the Confirmation, Continuation, and Consummation of Justification, you often say, but never prove. Sure I am *James* doth exclude Faith, which is without VVorks, *viz.* when God doth call for them, from the very Initiation of Justification. For he makes such a Faith as unprofitable as the Faith of Devils, who surely are so far from Justification, that they have not so much as the initiation of it.

Ad 7. You can never make more of that Conclusion *Jam.* 2. 24. than that a Man is justified by a VVorking Faith, or by a Faith which produceth VVorks, and so by his VVorks appears to be justified. The words if taken without any qualification, are against your self, who will have a Man justified at first by Faith without VVorks. If you will distinguish of Justification as at first, and as afterward, to make the Apostle agree with your meaning, though indeed it will not serve: Shall not others have leave to explain the Apostle so, as to make him agree not only with them, but also with himself, and the whole current of the Gospel? The word μόνον there imports no more than if it had been μόνης, as appears by the whole series of the Discourse, and more particularly by *v.* 17. where καθ' ἑαυτὴν is as much as μόνη, [*by it self*] *i. e.* alone without the concomitancy of VVorks, as the Fruits of it. *Beza* renders it *per se*; *Tremellius* out of the *Syriack Sola*: the Vulgar Latin hath *in semetipsa*, which *Cajetan* corrects, saying, *pro per se*; and that he expounds, *hoc est sola*. VVherein I suppose he followed *Erasmus*, whose Annotation on the place is, καθ' ἑαυτὴν, *i. e. per se, hoc est, sola.*

Ad 8. Rahab was justified by VVorks so as *Abraham* was, and all must be, even when they are first justified, *viz.* by a Faith prompt and ready to work when occasion doth require.

Ad 9. Our Divines by Faith understand a Sound and Orthodox Belief, *i. e.* Assent; and such is the Faith of the Devils spoken of *Jam.* 2. 19. such a Faith may be

without VVorks, and so is dead, *i. e.* unprofitable: but that is not the Justifying Faith which our Divines do speak of, (as I have shewed before) who hold that Faith alone doth justifie without VVorks, though withal they hold that Faith which doth justifie is not alone without VVorks, *viz.* when God doth call for them; and this is all that St. *James* urgeth. Your [illegible] *Analysis* doth evince no more than this, save that [illegible] and then you put a wrong gloss upon the Text, and ever and anon come in with your distinction betwixt the Initiation and the Continuation of Justification, quite besides, yea and against St. *James* his meaning, as (I think) I have sufficiently demonstrated.

In Jac. 2. *Oecumenius* a Greek Scholiast doth expound St. *James*, and reconcile him with St. *Paul*, after the same manner as I and others do; Οὐκ ἀντιφάσκει (saith he) ταῦτα τῷ μακαρίῳ Παύλῳ, κατὰ δύο σημαινομένων τῶν τῆς πίστεως ὀνόματος φερομένων. Sometimes (he saith) Faith is taken for a bare Assent, ἐπὶ τῆς ἁπλῆς συγκαταθέσεως, and so the Devils believe: Sometimes it notes also a disposition joyned with assent, τῷ ἐκ διαθέσεως ἐπακολουθοῦσι μετὰ βεβαίας συγκαταθέσεως. St. *James* (he saith) considereth Faith in the former sense, St. *Paul* in the latter. Ἰάκωβος μὲν τῷ ἁπλῷ φησι συγκατάθεσιν εἶναι πίστιν, &c. Παῦλος δὲ τῷ διαθέσεως λέγει, ἥτις ἐκ ἐξέρεως ἔργων μάλιστα.

To conclude, It is not Faith as working that doth justifie, but Faith as apprehending Christ and his Righteousness: Yet that Faith which doth apprehend Christ and his Righteousness, and so doth justifie, is a Working Faith. Your self grant that VVorks are not necessary *quoad præsentiam*, in respect of Justification as begun: and that they are necessary *quoad effectum justificationis*, in respect of Justification as continued, is more (I presume) than ever will be proved.

65, &c. 1. I let pass those things which you speak of *Calvin*, because I see nothing but bare words. As for *Clemens Rom. Ignatius*, *Justin Martyr*, and the rest, who for 1000 years after *Paul* (you say) give as much to Works, as you ever did, or more, and make Faith to justifie as a Condition, and * not as an Instrument, what-ever forced scraps some may gather out of a Line against the

* *To make Faith to be a Condition, is not to deny it to be an Instrument: Our Divines sometimes term it the one way, sometimes the other, as I have before shewed.*

the full scope of the whole Page or Book; I wish you had cited some Books, or Pages, or but Scraps, as you call them, whereby to make good what you say, I am not of such Reading, much less of such Memory, as to give an account of so many Authors. Some of them either wholly or in part I have read, but I do not remember where they do *ex professo* treat of Justification, and therefore I do not marvel if they do not speak so accurately of it.

But for the Opinion of the Ancient VVriters in this Point, I shall refer you unto some who were much better versed in them than I am, *viz.* *Fulk* on *Jam.* 2. 4. *Davenant de Justit. Habit. cap.* 25. where he answereth *Bellarmines* Allegations, and *cap.* 29. where he produceth his own.

And *Eckhard Compend. Theolog. Lib.* 2. *cap.* 3. who alledgeth *Chrysostome*, *Ambrose*, *Basil*, *Cyril*, *Austine* and *Bernard*, as holding Christ's Righteousness to be imputed unto us for our Justification. And he alledgeth *Ambrose*, *Hierome*, *Athanasius*, *Clemens Alex.* *Origen*, *Nazianzen*, *Chrysostome*, *Basil*, *Theodoret*, *Hesychius*, *Primasius*, *Epiphanius*, *Philastrius*, *Austin*, *Sedulius*, *Maxentius*, *Theodulus*, *Fortunatus*, *Victor Mar.* and *Bernard*, as testifying that we are justified by Faith alone without VVorks; and yet he saith he doth but *aliquot ex vetustâ antiquitate testimonia, quod ad hanc rem spectat, delibare.*

Beda, omitted by *Eckhard*, is cited by B. *Usher* as writing on *Psal.* 77. thus, *Per justitiam factorum nullus salvabitur, sed per solam justitiam fidei.* *De Statu & Succeff. & c. cap.* 2.

To your other Query concerning *Calvin*, *P. Martyr*, &c. I answer in the words of *Amesius*, *Fides specialis misericordiæ duplici ratione sic vocatur.* 1. *Quâ Christum apprehendit, vel innititur ipsi ad specialem misericordiam per ipsum apprehendendam.* 2. *Quâ misericordia specialem jam donatam apprehendit: priore sensu justificationem antecedit, posteriore sensu sequitur justificationem. Sed quia una & eadem est fides, quæ misericordiam Dei in Christo specialiter applicat apprehendendo, & applicationem illam jam factam certam reddit, & perfectio vel consolatio ejus in hac certitudine apparet, quam etiam hostes gratiæ præcipuè impugnant, idcirco per istam certitudinem (quæ tamen quoad sensum à* *pag.* 46. *Contra Bell. tom.* 4 *lib.* 5. *c.* 2. §. 22.

fide

fide potest ad tempus separari) fides justificans solet à multis describi.

Medul. l. 1. c. 27. §. 19. And again, *Fides ista justificans suâ naturâ producit, atque adeò conjunctam secum habet specialem ac certam persuasionem de gratiâ ac misericordiâ Dei in Christo. Unde etiam per istam persuasionem fides justificans non malè sæpè describitur ab Orthodoxis, præsertim cum impugnant generalem illam fidem, qui omnia tribuunt Pontificii. Sed 1. ista persuasio quoad sensum ipsius non semper adest. — 2. Varii sunt gradus hujus persuasionis, &c.*

2. By Apprehending, I do not mean bare Assent, but Embracing, or Receiving, or Applying.

Contra Bellar. *loco proximè citato.* *Amesius* cites and approves these words of *Contarenus*; *Accipimus justificationem per fidem. Hanc acceptationem* Thomas *in* 3. *appellat applicationem, inquiens passionem Christi esse veluti Medicinam communem, quam quisque sibi applicat per fidem & Sacramenta. Protestantes appellant apprehensionem, non eâ significatione, quæ pertinet ad cognitionem intellectus, sed quâ illud dicimur apprehendere, quo pervenimus, & quod post motum nostrum attingimus.*

I think that although Justifying-Faith doth receive Christ intirely, yet as Justifying it receiveth him only in respect of his Satisfaction, which is the Righteousness by which we are justified. There is no danger in this Doctrine, so long as People are taught withal, that they must not look to have Christ as a Priest satisfying for them, except they also have him as a King reigning over them. Neither doth it seem to me any gross conceit, That apprehending or applying of Christ's Satisfaction, or of Christ as satisfying for us, is that act of Faith whereby we are justified. Your Similitude doth not suit; because a Husband cannot be offered to a Woman in several respects, as Christ may be unto a Sinner. I do not conceive Faith to justifie *modo Physico*, or merely because it is of that nature to apprehend Christ and his Righteousness: If it were not for the Promise of the Gospel, this Act of Faith would not avail. As suppose the Devils should apprehend the Righteousness of Christ, yet should they not be justified, because the Promise of the Gospel doth not belong unto them. Yet this apprehending of Christ and his Righteousness being the Physical

Act

Act of Faith, and withal made the Condition of Justification, in that the Gospel doth promise Justification unto those that apprehend Christ and his Righteousnes; I see not but I may well say, That Faith doth justifie us, apprehending Christ and his Righteousnes, this being it which the Gospel doth require unto Justification. Faith as apprehending Christ being the Condition of Justification, it is all one to say, Faith doth justifie as apprehending Christ, and Faith doth justifie as the Condition required unto Justification. Whereas therefore you prove, That Faith or Acceptance of Christ simply considered in it self, doth not justifie; it is nothing to me, who do not ascribe any thing to Faith in order to Justification as it is considered simply in it self, but as it being of such a nature is in that respect required of us, to that end that we may be justified. And thus (I think) do others mean, when they say, That Faith doth justifie as apprehending Christ, and his Righteousnes: they do not (I suppose) exclude, but include the requiring of Faith in this respect as a Condition of Justification.

Pemble having said, [*We are justified by Faith, i. e. by the Righteousnes of Christ, the benefit whereof unto our justification we are made partakers of by Faith, as the only Grace which accepts of the Promise, and gives us assurance of the Performance*]. He adds a little after, [*He that looked on Christ believing in him, may truly be said to be saved and justified by Faith, not for the worth, and by the efficacy of that Act of his, but as it is the Condition of the Promise of Grace, that must necessarily go before the Performance of it unto us; upon our obedience whereunto, God is pleased of his free Grace to justifie us*]. Of Justif. §. 2. c. 1. p. 27.

But still notwithstanding all you say, my Argument remains good: [*Works concur not with Faith in apprehending Christ, therefore they concur not with it in justifying*]. The Consequence is good, because Faith as apprehending Christ is made the Condition of Justification. For this is that which Believing in, or on Christ, doth import, which is put as equivalent to the receiving of Christ, *Joh.* 1. 12. That Repentance and Obedience do concur with Faith in being Conditions of Continued and Consummate Justification, you only affirm, but do not prove. Indeed Repentance as taken for an ac-

acknowledgment of, and sorrow for sin, is requisite unto Justification at first. For how should we ever look unto Christ as suffering for our sins, except we be sensible of them, and humbled for them. Yet it is Faith apprehending Christ, which in the Covenant is made the Condition of our Justification, as that whereby we are made partakers of Christ's Righteousness, by which we are justified. It is neither Repentance, nor Obedience, though Repentance (in the sence before-mentioned) must go before this Justifying-Faith, and so before Justification; and obedience must follow after.

Contra Bellar. *Tom.* 4. *l.* 5. *c.* 4. §. 5.

Penitentia (saith *Amef.*) *quatenus est legalis humiliatio antecedit quidem justificationem, ut dispositio ex ordine rare justa, sed non ut causa. Resipiscentia Evangelica vere notat conversionem totam, cujus primaria pars est fides, ut* Act. 11. & Ezech. 18. *vel est ipsa fides justificantis, atque adeo ipsius justificationis effectum, qualis fuit pœnitentia illa ad salutem,* 2 Cor. 7. 10. *Quocunque modo accipiatur, dolor ac detestatio peccati non est ess. causa justificans, quia* (*N. B.*) *non habet vim apprehendi nobis justitiam Christi. Acquisitio talis boni non consistit in aversatione mali. Resipiscentia & fidei differentia hac indigitatur,* Act. 20. 21. *Resipiscentia in Deum, & fides in Dominum Nostrum Iesum Christum.* See also Mr. *Ball* of the *Coven.* c. 3. p. 18, 19.

69, &c. 1. You need not trouble your self to prove, That by VVorks are meant VVorks. For surely a working Faith, or a Faith bringing forth the Fruit of VVorks, doth imply VVorks. But the Question is, VVhether VVorks concur with Faith in justifying, or only are inseparable Attendants, and necessary Fruits of that Faith which justifieth. You hold the former, yet only in respect of continued and consummate Justification: I hold the latter in respect of Justification begun, continued, and consummate. VVhether of us hath more ground from Scripture, let it be judged by what hath been said about it.

But 1. whereas you say, That VVorks are still opposed to Faith without VVorks, or Faith alone, and not to this or that sort of Faith: I have shewed before from *Oecumenius* (not to speak of our late VVriters) that there is one sort of Faith that is with VVorks, or of a working Disposition, and such is Faith truly apprehending Christ;

and

and another sort of Faith; that is without VVorks, *viz.* a bare Assent: and that St. *James* doth oppose these two sorts of Faith one to the other, teaching that we are justified by the former, not by the latter.

2. You say, [*It is not only Faith alone without a working disposition, but Faith alone without Works themselves when there is opportunity*]; yet your self deny not only the efficacy, but even the presence of VVorks to be requisite, when we are at first justified: and St. *James* denies Faith alone (so as he doth speak of it) to have any force at all to justifie, as being dead and unprofitable. Therefore you must needs grant, That it is Faith alone, without a working Disposition of which St. *James* speaketh. Besides, if there be a working Disposition, there will be VVorks themselves when there is opportunity. But all this doth only prove, That Justifying Faith is of a working Disposition, and produceth VVorks themselves when opportunity is offered: That VVorks do at any time concur with Faith unto Justification, it no way proveth.

3. Surely a disposition to feed the hungry, is accepted of God, when there is no opportunity to do the thing it self. And so a Disposition to work may be enough to prove Faith to be of a right stamp, though VVorks themselves be requisite when there is opportunity: and still I must put you in mind, that your self requires no more than a disposition to work, when we are first justified.

4. What you can infer from *Jam.* 2. 13. I do not see. He that expects mercy from God, must shew mercy to his Neighbour. Doth it therefore follow, that VVorks of Mercy justifie as well as Faith? No, but that Justifying Faith must and will shew it self by VVorks of Mercy.

5. A real Faith being but a bare Assent, as in the Devils, cannot justifie or save. Who opposeth this? Or whom doth it oppose? So, that the same Faith is justifying and saving, I think all will yeeld: yet is there more required unto Salvation, as taken for the accomplishment of it, than unto Justification.

6. VVho makes *James* v. 18. to speak such non-sence as you tell of? Do they, who say his meaning is, That Faith is pretended in vain, if it do not shew it self by VVorks, as occasion doth require? And what more can any gather from *v.* 20, 22, 24, 26? You might save your labour

labour of proving, That by VVorks are meant VVorks: you should prove that Works are spoken of as concurring with Faith, and as having a co-interest with it in the effect of justifying, and not only as Fruits of that Faith by which we are justified. This is that which they mean, who say that *James* doth speak of a working Faith, *i. e.* a Faith ready to work, and so actually working, when God doth require it, not as if instead of [Works] it were good sense always to put [a working Faith]. Such sophistry doth not become us.

7. That *James* doth assert the necessity of Works, as fruits of Justifying Faith, is ever granted: that he doth assert the necessity of them as concurrent with Faith unto Justification, is never proved. Works are therefore necessary to prove Faith to be such as God requires unto Justification.

Against this first you say, *James* doth make VVorks or Working necessary to justifie; I say, he doth not, but only drives at this, That none must think to be justified by Faith, except it be a working Faith, as *Abraham*'s and *Rahab*'s was. You say, [*The Soul doth not truly signifie the Body to be alive*]. But the word *Jam.* 2. 26. is πνεῦμα, Breath, which is but an effect of Life, and not a cause of it.

Of Grace and Faith, *pag.* 240. [*Thus* (saith *Pemble*) *the comparison is exact; As the Body without Breath is dead, so is Faith without Works*].

Appendix to the Doctrine of the Certainty of Salvation. So *Downam*; [*Neither doth St.* James *compare Works to the Soul, but to the Breath, as the word* πνεῦμα (*derived of* πνέω *to Breath*) *doth properly signifie*, &c. *So that the meaning of St.* James *is, As the Body without Breath is dead, even so Faith without Works* (*which are as it were the breathing of a lively Faith*) *is dead*].

But if by πνεῦμα there be meant the Soul, as 1 *Cor.* 6. *ult.* I hope you will not so understand it, as to compare Faith to the Body, and Works to the Soul, as if Works were the Soul of Faith, and so did give Life unto it: whereas indeed Faith doth produce Works, and Works do but evidence Faith, and the lively power of it.

On *Jam.* 2. *ult.* [*The Apostle* (saith *Fulk*) *in this Similitude doth not make Faith the Body, and Works the Soul; but Works the Argument of the Life and Soul of Faith, which is trust in God*, &c.]

2. God

2. God (you say) needs no Signs. Well, but God (say I) requiring such a Faith, whereof Works are Signs, as Fruits and Effects of it, we must look to the signs of our Faith, to find it such as God requires of us to our Justification. *Maccovius* (it seems) met with the Objection; *At Deo non est opus experimento.* Resp. *Hoc sane verum est: at non proinde sequitur homines non præbere sui experimentum Deo.* *De Justif. Disp. 10. ubi plura in hanc rem vide-re licet.*

3. Faith may be real, and yet not justifying. A real Assent, yea and Consent, if limited, so as to exclude Christ's dominion over us, is not that Faith which your Opposers plead for.

4. The New Testament doth make a working Faith, yet not Faith as working the Condition of Justification. I wonder how you can stumble at this, when as you constantly hold, That we are justified at first by Faith without Works: yet surely that Faith whereby we are justified at first, is a working Faith, *i. e.* of a working Nature, and will, when there is opportunity, shew it self by Works. That working therefore is together with Faith the Condition of Justification, is more than your own Principles will admit, without that distinction of Justification Inchoated, and Justification Continued, of which though you make much use, yet I see little ground for it. Now for Dr. *Preston*'s words, which I cited, I think they are clear enough against you.

For first he saith, That Faith alone justifieth and maketh Works only Concomitants or Fruits of that Faith by which we are justified. You limit it to Justification as begun, but he speaks of Justification simply considered, and not as begun only.

2. He speaks indeed of a double Justification, but not as you do, nor to that intent to bring in a double Righteousness as requisite unto Justification. All that he intends is this, That we are justified only by Faith, according to *Paul*'s Doctrine; yet (as *James* teacheth) our Faith must appear to be a true Justifying Faith by VVorks, otherwise it is but a false and feigned Faith, as it pretendeth to be Justifying, and he that pretendeth it, is a Hypocrite. His words without doing violence unto them, can have no other sense put upon them. VVhen any one is accused of being but a seeming Believer, or a mere Believer without Obedience, take Believing merely as it

is

is the Condition of Justification by the Covenant, it is but (as I have often said) the making good this Accusation, That he is a Transgressor of the Law, and to be condemned by the Law for the transgression of it, and so much the more in that he neglected the benefit offered in the New Covenant. So that in this case to justifie a Man by his Faith and VVorks, is but indeed to plead that he is justified by the Righteousness of Christ imputed unto him through Faith, which Faith is proved to be sound and good by his VVorks.

1. I see you are very tenacious of your Opinion: but if you will not forsake your Opinion till you see better Arguments to draw you from it, marvel not if others will not embrace your Opinion till they see better Arguments to draw them to it. But to the Matter; Me-thinks you might easily see the meaning of this, that *Abraham*'s first Justification could not be by Faith, which was without VVorks, *i. e.* by Faith, which was not of a working Nature.

Thus in that very page (52.) I explained my self, saying, [Faith if it be alone without VVorks, *i. e. renuens operari, &c.* cannot justifie].

2. Do not you see that your Answer is to no purpose in limiting the words of the Apostle to Continued and Consummate Justification, whereas he doth utterly exclude Faith, which is without VVorks, or which is not of a working Disposition, from being able to justifie, as being a Faith that is dead and unprofitable?

In Jac. 2. 23. That which you so slight, as if it were *indignus vindice nodus*, Calvin (a Man as likely to see into the Apostle's meaning as another) calls *nodum insolubilem*, as I have before noted. That more Conditions are required unto Justification afterward than at first, is more than I can find, and more (I am perswaded) than will ever be proved. Did *Paul* when he speaketh so much of Justification by Faith without VVorks, *viz.* as concurring with Faith unto Justification, mean that we are so justified indeed to day, but not so to morrow, or some time after? All his Arguments shew the contrary. Yea, doth he not prove from *Gen.* 15. 6. that *Abraham* was justified only by Believing, when as yet that was not the beginning of his Justification? So when *James* saith, That we are not justified by Faith, which is without VVorks, such a Faith being

being dead, and no better than the Faith of Devils; was his meaning this, That hereafter indeed we cannot be so justified, but yet at present we may? If you be of this mind, *Non equidem invideo, miror magis.*

3. Of the sense of *James* his Discourse enough before. And for *v.* 17. I think it might easily let you see that he speaketh not (as you suppose) only of Continued and Consummate Justification, but of Inchoated also, and consequently that he cannot be interpreted otherwise than thus, That Faith which doth not shew it self by VVorks, is dead, ineffectual, and of no force to justifie, either at first or afterward, as not being that Faith which is required unto Justification, *viz.* a working Faith; or Faith which is of a working Nature. I have noted before what *Oecumenius* (one that was long before either *Calvin* or *Luther*) saith upon that very Verse, as also how in the judgment of the Syriack Interpreter, and other Learned Men κατ' ἐνεργειαν there is to be understood.

1. Though Faith may be true and real without Works, yet a living Faith it is not; for a living Faith is operative, so that, a working Faith, and a non-working Faith are of different Natures, this being but a bare and naked Assent, but the other an apprehending of Christ, and a receiving of him. I little doubt but the Faith of Devils, and the Faith of Men who are justified (even at first, when you say VVorks are not requisite in respect of their presence with Faith, though that Faith (say I) is of a working Disposition), differ much in their very Nature. *Ibid.*

2. If you will be true to your own Principles, you cannot say, That VVorks make Faith alive, or that Faith is not alive without VVorks as actually present, though you consider Faith meerly as a Condition of Justification, seeing you hold Faith to be alive in that respect, when we are first justified, though there be no VVorks present with it. And though, as there must be a promptitude to VVorks at first, so there must be VVorks themselves in due season; yet that VVorks do afterward concur with Faith unto Justification, is more than yet I see, or (I presume) ever shall see proved.

3. Therefore my Argument stands good against you, until you can make it appear, That Faith alone without the Copartnership of VVorks, is the Condition of Justi-

fication at first, but Faith and VVorks together of Justification afterward. I have shewed some Reasons against it, but I can see none for it. Your Similitude of a Fine, &c. is no proof. Similitudes may illustrate something, but they prove nothing.

Ibid. 1. You said, [*The Apostle saith, That Faith did Work in and with his Works*]; whereas the Apostle using the word συνεργεῖν did not speak of working in, but only of working with.

2. Of what validity that distinction is (of Justification Inchoated, and Justification Continued and Consummate) you have not yet shewed.

3. VVhat *Calvin*'s Opinion otherwise was, is not to the purpose. I only alledged his Expositon of those words, *Fides cooperata est operibus suis*; and I think his Exposition is genuine.

On *Jam.* 2. 22. So also Mr. *Manton*; [*That sense which I prefer,* (saith he) *is, That his Faith rested not in a naked bare Profession, but was operative, it had its efficacy and influence upon his Works, co-working with all other Graces: it doth not only exert, and put forth it self in acts of Believing, but also in working*].

Beza renders it, *Administra fuit operum ejus*, and expounds it, *Efficax & fœcunda bonorum operum.*

Ibid. & 73. 1. I shewed before how not only *Piscator* and *Pemble*, but many others both before and after them, interpret those words, [*By Works his Faith was made perfect*]; *i. e.* By VVorks his Faith did appear perfect, *i. e.* sound and good. This Exposition is such that as yet I see no reason to dislike it.

2. I grant that Faith without VVorks (*viz.* when God doth require them) is dead as to the effect of Justifying; Yea, and it is also dead in it self, being but a dead Assent, having no life, no operative vertue in it.

3. *Abraham*'s Faith was, is, and shall be manifested to be perfect, *i. e.* sincere by his VVorks, to all that were, are, and shall be able to discern the true nature of Justifying Faith. Although there were none then that could discern this, (which yet is not to be supposed, *Isaac* was then of age to discern it, and so others of *Abraham*'s Family to whom the thing was known) yet to after-Ages the perfection of *Abraham*'s Faith is made manifest by his VVorks, especially his offering his Son upon the Altar.

And

And if God did say, [*Now I know that thou fearest me*, &c.] why may it not be said, speaking of God, ἀνθρωποπαθῶς, that thereby *Abraham*'s Faith and its Perfection appeared to God himself? Certain it is, that the VVork spoken of did proceed from Faith, *Heb.* 11.7. And therefore as the Effect doth shew the Cause to be perfect, so did *Abraham*'s VVorks (especially that of offering up *Isaac*) shew his Faith to be perfect. To the Second:

1. Though Justifying Faith include in it three Acts, mentioned *Heb.* 11. 13. yet there are but two of them properly and peculiarly Acts of Faith. For Seeing, or Knowing, the first there mentioned, is but presupposed unto Faith.

Bellarmine in this saith truly, (though it was little to his purpose); *Cognitio apprehensiva præexigitur quidem ad fidem, sed non est ipsa propriè fides.* *De Justif. lib.* 1. *c.* 15.

The other two Acts, *viz.* Persuasion and Embracing, though distinct, yet are both comprehended in Believing.

2. I see no cloudiness in this, [*Believing justifieth, not as it is our Act, but in respect of its Object*]; neither is this to speak darkness, except to a dark Understanding, which (I know) yours is not. But you know what is said of some, *Faciunt nimium intelligendo, ut nihil intelligant.* VVhat is more vulgar with Divines (and those no vulgar ones neither) than to say, That Faith doth not justifie as it is a VVork of ours, but in respect of its Object, Christ, whom it apprehendeth, and by whom so apprehended, we are justified?

Hujus satisfactionis apprehendendæ medium (saith Vigner. *de* one whom *Rivet* much commends) *fides est. Deo sic Satisfact. ordinante, ut non alii illius participes sint, quam qui Christi ineam sincerâ fide amplectuntur, non ita tamen ut ipsa per opera fides ratione sui nos Deo gratos faciat & acceptos, sed* Rivet. *ratione objecti, quod apprehendit, & cujus meritum nobis Disp.* 13. *applicat, & perfectam obedientiam.*

So *Rivet* himself saith; *Fides non justificat, quatenus est opus justitiæ, sed quatenus apprehendit justitiam Christi.* *De Fide Justif. Disp.* 10.

Divers others to this purpose have been cited before.

Your Question [*Why doth not the Object justifie without the Act?*] is soon answered; Because the Act (Believing)

lieving) is required on our part, *Deo sic ordinante*, (as the Author before-cited saith) That so the Object (Christ's Righteousness) may become ours unto Justification: yet still it is in respect of the Object (Christ's Righteousness) that the Act (Believing) doth justifie. You darken my words, when you transform them thus, [*It justifieth in respect to its Object*]; I say, [in respect of its Object], and so you first cited it. My meaning is this, It is the Object of Faith, *viz.* Christ's Righteousness, though as apprehended by Faith, whereby we are justified.

Medul. l. 1. c. 27. §. 14. *Est autem haec justificatio propter Christum* (saith *Amesius*) *non absolute consideratam, quo sensu Christus etiam est causa ipsius vocationis, sed propter Christum fide apprehensum.*

This is clear by that *Acts* 13. 39. [*By him all that believe are justified*].

I will add Mr. *Ball*'s words, which in sense are the same with mine, and there is little difference (as to clearness or cloudiness) in the Expression; [*The Third Exposition is, That when Faith is imputed for Righteousness, it is*

Of the Coven. c. 6. p. 65. *not understood materially, as though the Dignity, Worth, and Perfection of Faith made us just; but relatively and in respect of its Object: that is, to us believing, Righteousness, &c. of Christ, is freely imputed, and by Faith we freely receive Righteousness, and remission of sins freely given of God. And therefore to say, Faith justifieth, and Faith is imputed for Righteousness, are phrases equivalent. For Faith justifieth not by its merit or dignity, but as an Instrument, and correlatively, that is, the merit of Christ apprehended and received by Faith, justifieth, not Faith, whereby it is apprehended and received, unless it be by an improper speech, whereby the Act of the Object, by reason of the near and strict connexion betwixt them, is given to the Instrument*].

3. What you have said before about Works perfecting Faith, hath been considered. Though Faith may save without manifestation, yet not except it be of that nature, as to manifest it self by Works, when God doth call for them.

You say, [*Works do perfect Faith, ut Medium & Conditio*]; you mean of Justification: but that Works are *Medium & Conditio Justificationis*, you do not prove.

The

The Tree and its Fruit are considered as distinct; *ut Causa & Effectum, non ut Totum & Pars*; and so the perfection of the Tree is only manifested by its Fruit. It is not therefore a good Tree, because it beareth good Fruit; but it therefore beareth good Fruit, because it is a good Tree.

For the Third: If Procreation (as you grant) do not perfect Marriage in its Essence, then it adds only an accidental perfection unto it.

4. Your Explication is indeed now more full, so that I can better see your meaning, yet still I am unsatisfied. For I do not conceive that Faith properly is our Covenant, but that whereby we embrace God's Covenant. Though a Covenant differ from a Promise, yet it doth include a Promise. Now a Promise is *de futuro*; so that our reciprocal Promise, both of Faith and Obedience, I take to be our Covenant. Faith is in part the matter of the Covenant, but not properly the Covenant it self, and perhaps when you call it our Covenant, you only mean, that it is the matter of our Covenant.

I being there the Respondent, it was sufficient for me to deny, the proof did lie upon you. Yet nevertheless the Assertion (*viz.* Faith alone is the Condition of the Covenant, for so much as concerns Justification) is sufficiently proved by those places, where we are said to be justified by Faith, and that without Works, *viz.* as concurring with Faith unto Justification. And for the reason of the Assertion, (*viz.* because Faith alone doth apprehend Christ's Righteousness) much hath been said of it before. What do our Divines more inculcate than this? 73.

Wotton saith, that only Faith doth justifie; *Quia solâ fide rectâ in Christum tendimus, & promissiones Dei de justificatione amplectimur. De Reconcil. Part* 1. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 18.

Amesius saith; *Dolor ac detestatio peccati non potest esse causa justificans, quia non habet vim applicandi nobis justitiam Christi. Contra* Bellar. *tom.* 4. *lib.* 5. *cap.* 4. *sect.* 5.

So *Bucanus*; *Fides* (*inquit*) *sola justificat, quia ipsa est unicum instrumentum, & unica facultas in nobis, quâ recipimus justitiam Christi. Loc.* 31. *ad Quæst.* 37.

Of the Coven. chap. 3. p.18,19.

Thus also Mr. *Ball*; [*By Repentance we know our selves, we feel our selves, we hunger and thirst after Grace; but the hand which we stretch forth to receive it, is Faith alone*, &c.] And a little after; [*When therefore Justification and Life is said to be by Faith, it is manifestly signified, That Faith receiving the Promise, doth receive Righteousness and Life freely promised*].

You your self do sometimes say, That Faith hath in it an aptitude to justifie in this respect; only you deny, that this aptitude of Faith is sufficient, and say that therefore it doth justifie, because God in his Covenant hath made it the Condition of Justification. Now I also grant, That if Faith were not ordained to that end of God, its bare aptitude, or its being that whereby we apprehend Christ, would not justifie. Yet (I say) it appears by Scripture, That because Faith alone hath this aptitude to justifie, *viz.* by apprehending Christ, therefore God hath made it alone the Condition of Justification. This appears in that we are said to be justified by Believing in, or on Christ, which imports an apprehending and receiving of him, *Joh.* 1. 12.

2. Repentance doth avail with Faith, yet are we justified only by Faith, and not by Repentance, and that for the reason even now alledged, *viz.* because not Repentance, but Faith is the Hand by which Christ is received.

3. Though Remission of Sins be ordinarily ascribed to Repentance, yet it is no where said, That Repentance is imputed unto us for Righteousness, as it is said of Faith. Repentance in some sense is precedaneous to Justification, Justifying Faith doth presuppose Repentance; yet Faith and not Repentance is made the Condition and Instrument of Justification, as being that which doth apprehend the Righteousness of Christ, by which we are justified.

4. That though Faith only be the Condition of Justification at first, yet Obedience also is a Condition afterward, is often said, but never proved. I take Justification both at first and afterward to be by the Righteousness of Christ imputed to us; therefore not by Obedience, but by Faith, by which alone we apprehend the Righteousness of Christ, that so it may be ours unto Justification. Certainly that was not the beginning of *Abraham's*

ham's Justification, which is mentioned *Gen.* 15. 6. Yet by that doth the Apostle prove that *Abraham* was, and all must be, justified, not by Obedience, but by Faith only.

1. Faith apt to produce good Works, is necessary to procure that first change, which makes us (in God's account) *Justos ex Injustis*. For if it be not such a Faith, it is dead, and of no force. *Ib.* & 74.

2. I hope you will not deny, but that being justified by Believing, every after Act of Faith doth find us justified; for you are against the Amission and Intercision of Justification. Yet I confess, That the continuance of Faith is necessary to the continuance of Justification. So it must needs be, seeing we are justified by Faith; therefore every Act of Faith may be said to justifie, as well as the first Act, because by after-Acts of Faith we continue justified.

Nihil erit absurdi, (*inquit* Rivetus) *si dicamus, in quolibet veræ fidei actu imputari justitiam credenti. Etsi enim justificatio sit actus momentaneus, cujus nunquam planè amittitur effectus in pios, qui semel justificati sunt, indigent nihilominùs renovatione sensus justificationis suæ, qui sensus fit per fidem, & tunc dicitur etiam fides imputari ad justitiam. Nam apprehensio illa fidei habet fluxum suum continuum secundùm plus & minus; præsertim cum fidelis, & si justificatus, subinde in peccata incidat, propter quæ opus etiam habet remissione peccatorum. Quod continuum beneficium fide apprehensum, si secundam justificationem appellare velint adversarii, imò tertiam, quartam, quintam, & millesimam, non repugnabimus, dummodo constet, nullâ aliâ ratione nos justificari à peccatis sequentibus, quàm eâ, quâ semel justificati fuimus à præcedentibus.* In Gen. 15. Exer. 83.

Works therefore do not concur with Faith unto Justification no more afterward than at first.

3. Your reasons whereby you endeavour to confute this Assertion, [*As our Justification is begun, so it is continued*, viz. *by Faith only, and not by Works as concurrent with Faith unto Justification afterward, though not at first*] seem to be of no force.

I answer therefore, *Ad* 1. How do I contradict it by saying, [As it is begun, so it is continued by Faith?] What though there be divers Acts of Faith, yet still it is

Faith, and Faith without the concurrence of Works, by which we are justified as well afterward as at first, which is all that I assert? Because a continued Act of Faith is requisite to the Continuation of Justification, doth it therefore follow that Works have a co-interest with Faith in the effect of Justifying?

* *How Repentance is requisite unto Justification, and yet doth not justifie, was shewed before.* 74.

Ad 2. Do you think * Repentance only requisite to the Continuation of Justification, and not also to the Inchoation of it?

Ad 3. We are not to measure God's Covenant by Humane Covenants. God's Covenant doth reach further than to Justification; and more may be requisite for the enjoyment of those benefits which belong unto Justified Persons, than is requisite unto Justification.

Your Similitudes are no Proofs; and you still suppose that there is one Condition of Justification at first, and another Condition thereof afterwards; that though at first we are justified only by Faith, yet afterward by Faith and Works. But though Works are required of Justified Persons, as Fruits of that Faith whereby they are justified; yet they do not therefore concur with Faith unto Justification, which as it is begun by Faith only, so is it also continued. Your self observe, That *Abraham*'s Believing, mentioned *Gen.* 15. was not his first Act of Faith. So then he was justified before by Faith, and so was he also afterward, even by Faith only, as the Apostle from that very place doth prove *Rom.* 4. Therefore by Faith without Works (*viz.* as having a co-partnership with Faith in Justifying), *Abraham* was justified both at first and afterward.

Ibid. 1. Do you think that *Abraham* was justified from the guilt of those many sins, which he committed after his first Justification by his Works? *Credat Judæus*: for my part I cannot but detest such Doctrine. I know no way whereby he could be justified from those sins, but by Faith in Christ, even as he was at first justified. Besides (as I noted before, and that as acknowledged by your self), *Abraham* was justified before he produced that Act of Faith spoken of *Gen.* 15. and in the *interim* no doubt he committed some sins; yet still by Faith, and not by Works (as *Paul* sheweth) * he was justified.

* *Vide* Calvin. *Instit. l.* 3. *c.* 14 §. 11.

2. You do but still affirm, without any proof at all, That *Abraham*'s Justification could not be continued by the

the same means (*viz.* by Faith alone) works not concurring with it unto Justification) as it was begun.

3. For Sentential Justification at the Last Judgment, I have said enough before.

Bucan having said, that *Abraham* was Justified *operibus, tanquam testimonis Justificationis*; Adds, *Quomodo etiam Deus dicitur in extremo illo die justificaturus electos suos ex ipsorum operibus.* *Loc.* 31. *ad quæst.* 39.

And again; *Fides principium existentiæ, facit ut simus justi; Opera autem ut principium cognitionis faciunt, ut cognoscamur justi. Ideò Deus in extremo die proponet principium cognitionis justitiæ fidei, quod incurret in oculos omnium creaturarum.*

4. I think the Argument is good and sound, [Christ's Righteousness, whereby we are justified, is an everlasting Righteousness; therefore our Justification is an everlasting Justification]. This always presupposed, That this Righteousness of Christ be apprehended by Faith; for otherwise there is no being justified at all by it.

1. To be just *quoad præstationem Conditionis*, is but to be just in some respect; and in some respect just even the most unjust may be. Yet it is true, This *præstatio Conditionis* will be of force to procure Universal Justification: not that it is it self the Righteousness by which we are justified, but only the Means whereby we are made Partakers of the Righteousness of Christ, and so by his Righteousness are universally justified. And though this performing of the Condition be required unto Justification, yet nevertheless that remains good which I said in the *Animadversions*, [*If we be fully freed from the accusation of the Law, we are fully justified*]. For can we be fully freed from the Accusation of the Law, except we perform the Condition required in the Gospel? And if we be fully freed from the Accusation of the Law, will the Gospel accuse us? *It is the Law that worketh Wrath*, Rom. 4. 15. The Gospel doth free from Wrath, though not without performing the Condition; for then it suffereth the Law to have its force, and to inflict Wrath; and that so much the more, in that so great a benefit was neglected. *Ibid.* & 75.

2. The performing of a Condition, as the Condition is a Duty, is a Righteousness, but such as cannot justifie,

as

as we now speak of Justification. But as the Condition is meerly a Condition, the performing of it is not properly Righteousness, though by it we partake of Righteousness, *viz.* the Righteousness of Christ, by which we are justified.

3. Therefore this is no contradiction, to grant Faith to be the Condition of Justification, and yet to deny it to be the Righteousness by which we are justified.

De Satisfact. Christi, inter Opera Riveti Disp. 13. §. 61.

That which you think to be most clear, *Vignerius* (before cited) thought most absurd. *An possibile est (inquit) ut sit Fides Instrumentum accipiendæ justitiæ, (seu Conditio ad obtinendam justitiam requisita, si ita loqui libeat) & simul sit ipsa, quam quærimus, justitia?*

Indeed you seem but to strive about words; for here immediately you confess, That it is but a Subordinate Righteousness, meaning (I think) that which all acknowledg, that it is but a means whereby to partake of Christ's Righteousness. And you that charge others with Self-Contradiction, seem not to agree with your self. For here presently after you say, [*This Personal Righteousness* præstitæ conditionis N. T. *must be had, before we can have that which freeth us from the Law*]; yet elsewhere your Expressions are such, as if being first justified from the Accusation of the Law, by the Righteousness of Christ, we should after be justified from the Accusation of the Gospel by Personal Righteousness. However (as I have said before) this latter Accusation is but a further prosecution and confirmation of the former, by taking away the Plea that some might make why the Accusation of the Law should not stand good, and be of force to condemn them.

4. Of what force is Satans Accusation against any, if he cannot make good his Accusation, so as to procure his Condemnation? And are not Unbelievers and Rebels against Christ condemned by the Law? Is it not for sin that they are condemned? And is there any sin which is not against the Law? The Gospel indeed may aggravate Sin, and increase Condemnation: and so those words which you cite [*The words which I speak, shall judg you,* &c.] may be understood; as those are more clearly to the purpose *Joh.* 15. 22. *If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin,* (*viz.* in so high degree

degree as it follows) *but now they have no cloak for their sin.* But still it is by the Law that all sinners are convinced and condemned. As for Righteousness, whereby one is justified from a false Accusation, it is but such as the Devil himself may have, as hath been noted before, though Faith be of force to take off all Satan's Accusations whatsoever. And when Satan doth accuse any of not performing the Condition of the Gospel, he doth but only shew that such stand guilty by the Law, and so are to be condemned, as having no benefit of the Gospel, because they have not performed the Condition of it: So that still it is the Law, by which Satan doth accuse and bring to condemnation.

But by the way I observe, That in this place of your *Aphor.* (*p.* 308.) you say, That *Rom.* 3. 28. and 4. 2, 3, 14, 15, 16. *Paul* concludeth, that neither Faith, nor Works, is the Righteousness which we must plead against the Accusation of the Law, but the Righteousness which is by Faith, *i. e.* Christ's Righteousness: Yet before in this Writing you stand upon the very Letter of the Text, and will have it to prove, That Faith it self properly taken is our Righteousness. If you say that you mean our Evangelical Righteousness, yet so you agree not with your self in your *Aphorisms*, where you make *Paul* in those Texts to speak of our Legal Righteousness.

1. They against whom *James* disputed, relied on Faith as the Condition of the New Covenant; but it was not such a Faith as the New Covenant doth require, it was a Faith *renuens operari*; upon that account *James* confuted them, not as if Faith alone without Works (though yet a Faith ready to shew it self by Works) were not the Condition of Justification. 75.

2. I am sorry that *Beza*'s words, which I cited, and which to me seem very excellent, should be so censured by you, as if there were I know not how many mistakes in them; but truly I think the mistakes will be found to be in your censure.

To your Exceptions I answer; 1. *Quis vel ex nostris, vel ex Transmarinis Theologis, Fidem pro Causâ (nempe Instrumentali) Justificationis non habet?*

2. Beza *ait, tu negas*; *Utri potius assentiendum? Quid dico* Beza? *Quis enim istud non dicit? Sed hominum authoritate nolo te obruere, rationes antè allatæ expendantur.* 3. *Affir-*

3. *Affirmas tantùm, non probas, Opera à* Jacobo *stabiliri ut Justificationis Conditiones & Media. Effecti ut effecti potest esse necessitas ad veritatem causæ comprobandam, nec aliâ ratione operum necessitas à* Jacobo *stabilitur; neque enim ad justificationem procurandam, sed ad eam duntaxat comprobandam, tanquam Justificantis Fidei fructus, Opera ut necessaria stabiliuntur, ut anteâ ex ipsâ Apostoli Argumentatione ostensum est.*

4. *Nec* Beza, *nec alius quisquam (quòd sciam) distinctionem istam de Justificatione Inchoatâ, & Justificatione Continuatâ, quasi sc. alia hujus, alia illius esset conditio, perspectam habuit. Hujus inventionis gloriam ego equidem tibi non invideo.*

Ibid. 1. Certain it is, All Works are not the fulfilling of the Old Law's Condition: but all Works whereby we are justified, are the fulfilling of it; and therefore (as I said in the *Animadversions*) to be justified by Works, and to be justified by the Law, are with *Paul* one and the same; See *Rivet, Disp de Fide Justif.* §. 21. the words are before cited.

2. We are justified by the New Law, against the Accusation of the Old Law. Certainly if we be accused of Unbelief and Rebellion against Christ, we are accused of being Sinners. For are Unbelief and Rebellion against Christ no sins?

3. Who doth not so distinguish of τὸ *Credere*, except some few whom I have no mind to follow? But how will this Distinction, *inter quod opus, & quâ opus*, serve to keep in Obedience, as having a joint interest with Faith in Justification? What dark Equivocal (I pray) is this, That Faith doth justifie as that whereby we are made Partakers of Christ's Righteousness? Your self acknowledges an aptitude in Faith to justifie in this respect; and in this respect (I say) Faith is appointed to be the Condition of Justification.

Ibid. I take what you grant, *viz.* That *Paul* doth not imply Obedience as concurrent with Faith in our first Justification: that he doth imply it as concurrent in our Justification afterward, you should prove, and not content your self with the bare affirming of it. Doth not *Paul* by that *Gen.* 15. [*Abraham believed God*, &c.] prove that *Abraham* was justified by Faith without the concurrence of Obedience? Yes that was not the first time

that

that *Abraham* either believed, or was justified. The truth therefore is, *Paul* implieth Obedience as the Fruit of that Faith which justifieth both at first and last, but not as concurring with Faith unto Justification either at first or last.

1. There is a necessity of Faith shewing it self by Works, that so it may appear to be such a Faith whereby Christ is truly apprehended and received. But are Works therefore Copartners with Faith in justifying, because only such a Faith doth justifie as doth also produce Works? You exclude Works from having any thing to do in our Justification at first, yet surely Works must follow as Fruits of that Faith whereby we are at first justified. *Ibid.* & 76.

2. For the Texts alledged, that *Mat.* 12. 37. [*By thy words thou shalt be justified*, &c.] is as plain you say as [*We are justified by Faith*]. But if it be so plain, it may seem wonderful, that *Bellarmine* should never make use of it, when he labours to prove, That Faith alone doth not justifie; which (so far as I observe) he doth not. Nor do the Rhemists on the place take any notice of those words, who yet are ready to catch at every thing that may but seem to make for them. Yet it seems some of our Romish Adversaries have laid hold on those words.

But hear how *Calvin* doth censure them for it; *Quod autem Papista ad enervandam fidei justitiam hoc torquent, puerile est.* Ad *Mat.* 12. 37.

Certainly all good that we do, may justifie *quadantenus*, so far as it is good: But can we therefore be simply and absolutely, or (if you like those terms better) fully and perfectly justified, either by our Words or Works? Those places that require forgiving of others, that so God may forgive us, shew indeed, that it is no true Justifying Faith which doth not, as occasion requires, manifest it self in that kind: but we are not therefore justified as well by forgiving others, as by believing; nor doth the forgiving of others concur with Faith unto Justification. That in 1 *John* 1. 9. and *Acts* 3. 19. shews that Repentance must go before Justification, and is required unto Justification, but not so as Faith is required.

Repen-

Multa requiruntur ad Justificationem quæ non justificant Amef. *loco ante citato.*

Repentance is required, that we may be justified, but not that we may be justified by it, as we are by Faith, though Instrumentally and Relatively, as it apprehendeth Christ's Righteousness by which we are justified. For Prayer, it is a Fruit of Faith, and therefore called, *The Prayer of Faith*, Jam. 5. 15.

[*Repentance* (saith Mr. *Ball* Of the Coven. *c.* 3. *p.* 18.) *is the Condition of Faith, and the Qualification of a Person capable of Salvation: but Faith alone is the Cause of Justification and Salvation on our part required*].

And immediately after he adds; [*It is a penitent and petitioning Faith, whereby we receive the promises of Mercy; but we are not justified, partly by Prayer, partly by Repentance, but by that Faith which stirreth up Godly sorrow for sin, and inforceth us to pray for Pardon and Salvation*].

And again; [*Prayer is nothing else but the Stream or River of Faith, and an issue of the desire of that which joyfully we believe*]. Of Faith, *Part* 1. *Chap.* 8. *pag.* 105.

For that place, *Acts* 22. 16. the Exposition which I gave of it in the *Animadversions*, is confirmed by this, That the nature of a Sacrament is to signifie and seal, as the Apostle shews, *Rom.* 4. 11.

Quatenus ergò fidem nostram adjuvat Baptismus, (*inquit* Calvinus) *ut remissionem peccatorum percipiat ex solo Christi sanguine, Lavacrum animæ vocatur. Ita ablutio, cujus meminit* Lucas, *non causam designat; sed ad sensum* Pauli *refertur, qui symbolo accepto, peccata sua esse expiata* (*N. B.*) *melius cognovit.—Cum testimonium haberet* Paulus *gratiæ Dei, jam illi remissa erant peccata. Non igitur Baptismo demum ablutus est, sed novam gratiæ, quam adeptus erat, confirmationem accepit.*

That *Paul*'s sins were but incompleatly washed away by Faith until he was baptized, your Similitudes (which are too often your only proofs) do not prove. Yea, a Kings Coronation, (of which you speak) when the Kingdom is hereditary, is (I think) but a confirmation of what was done before.

The purifying of the Heart spoken of, 1 *Pet.* 1. 22. is (I conceive) to be understood as *Jam.* 4. 8. & *Jer.* 4. 14.

viz.

viz. of purifying from the filth of sin by Sanctification. And for 1 *Pet.* 4. 18. who denies the diligence of the Righteous to be a means of their Salvation! But what is that to prove Works to concur with Faith unto Justification?

1. I take what you grant, That at first believing a Man is justified so fully, as that he is acquitted from the guilt of all Sin, and from all Condemnation. And surely at the last one can have no fuller Justification than this is. That afterwards he is acquitted from the guilt of more sins, is not to the purpose, seeing he is acquitted from all at first, and but from all at last, though this [all] be more at last than at first. Otherwise the Justification of one who hath fewer sins, should not be so full as the Justification of him, whose sins are more in number. 76, & 77.

2. That there is a further Condition of Justification afterward than at first, hath been said often, but was never yet proved.

3. That which you call Sentential Justification, (*viz.* at the Last Judgment) I hold to be only the manifestation of that Justification which was before. That because Obedience is a Condition of Salvation, heretofore it is also a Condition of Justification, I deny (as you see) all along in the *Animadversions*, and therefore I thought it enough here to touch that, which you say of full Justification, especially seeing your self hold Obedience to be no Condition of Justification at first. You lay the weight of your 78*th* Thesis upon the word [full] which therefore was enough for me to take hold of.

For your Queries therefore about Sentential Justification at Judgment, I have told you my mind before, and you might sufficiently understand it by the *Animadversions*.

When you prove, 1. that Justification at Judgment is a Justification distinct from Justification here, and not only a manifestation of it.

2. That Justification at Judgment hath the same Conditions with Salvation, as taken for the accomplishment of it, *viz.* Glorification.

And, 3. That consequently Obedience is a Condition of Justification at Judgment. When you shall prove (I say) these things, I shall see more than yet I do.

In the mean while, besides what hath been said before, hear

Loc. 31. quæst. 46. hear what *Bucan* saith to this purpose; *An perficitur justificatio nostra in hâc vitâ? In Justificatione quemadmodum judicamur, & reputamur à Deo justi, ita etiam adjudicamur vitæ æternæ. Ratione igitur decreti divini, & sententiæ ipsius de vitâ æternâ prolatæ à Deo judice; item ratione justitiæ, quam imputat nobis Judex Cœlestis, jam perfecta est justificatio nostra in hâc vitâ, nisi quod in alterâ magis patefacienda (N. B.) sit ac revelanda eadem illa justitia imputata, & arctiùs etiam nobis applicanda. Ea tamen tota perficitur in hâc vitâ, in quâ potest homo dici plenè perfectèque justificatus. Filii Dei sumus (ergo justificati) sed nondum patefactum est quid erimus,* 1 John 3. 2. *At si executionem respicias, & rationem habeas vitæ, & gloriæ, quæ nobis adjudicatur, & quæ nobis inhæsura est, quia in nobis non perficitur in hâc vitâ, imperfecta etiam Justificatio in hâc vitâ censeri potest.*

Non impediunt vitii originalis residui maculæ illæ, quin etiam in hâc vitâ perfecta sit justificatio. Quæ reverâ nec intenditur, nec remittitur, rem ipsam quod attinet. Gataker. *contra* Gomarum. *p.* 26, 27.

1. I think there is not the like right of Salvation and Justification, but that although we must be saved by Works, though not by the Merit of them, yet we cannot be justified by Works, except it be by the merit of them. My reason is, Because that whereby we are justified, must fully satisfie the Law; for it must fully acquit us from all Condemnation, which otherwise by the Law will fall upon us. This Works cannot do, except they be fully conform to the Law, and so be meritorious, as far forth as the Creature can merit of the Creator. But being justified by Faith, *i. e.* by the Righteousness of Christ through Faith imputed to us, and so put into a state of Salvation, we must yet shew our Faith by our Works; which though they be imperfect, and so not meritorious, yet make way for the full enjoyment of Salvation. And me-thinks the Scripture is so frequent and clear in distinguishing betwixt Justification and Salvation, as to the full enjoyment of it, that it may seem strange that you should so confound them as you do, and argue as if there were the same reason of the one as of the other.

2. You might easily see, that by [*Via Regni*] as opposed to [*Causa Regnandi*]; I meant only to exclude the Merit of Works, not to deny Works to be a Means and

and a Condition required of us for the obtaining of compleat Salvation. Salvation is a Chain consisting of many Links; but so is not Justification; it is but one Link of that Chain.

3. If all the World of Divines be against this, That Justification at Judgment is but a Declaration of our Justification here; I have hitherto (it seems) been in some other World For truly (so far as I observe) both Scripture and Divines usually speak of Justification, as we here partake of it. As for Justification at Judgment, it is but rarely touched, either in Scripture or in other Writings: Neither (so far as I can see) will it consist with either, to make Justification at Judgment a compleating of our Justification, as if before we were but imperfectly justified: but rather they shew, that our Justification is then fully declared and made manifest, and that then we come to the full enjoyment of that benefit, which we have right unto by our Justification, *viz.* Glorification. *For whom he justified, them he also glorified*, Rom. 8. 30. I have spoken enough of this before; but you do so continually repeat the same things, that I am forced also to repeat things oftner than I would.

1. That Justification by Sentence, *viz.* at the Last Judgment, and Continued Justification, are several kinds of Justification distinct from Justification begun, and have several Conditions, you continually affirm, or suppose, but never prove. *Ibid.*

2. My debate with you was about those words, [*That which we are justified by, we are saved by*]; and [*the full possession or enjoyment of Salvation*]. What your reply is to the purpose, I cannot see. And besides, you had need to clear those words, [*In justifying it is the same thing to give a right to a thing, and to give the thing it self*]. For if you mean, That as soon as a right to a thing is given by Justification, the thing it self also is actually given; it appears to me far otherwise. For I think that Justification presently gives a right to Glorification; For what doth debar from that right, but sin? Now the guilt of sin is done away by Justification; therefore there is a present right too to Glorification, yet no present enjoyment of it. How I do yeeld your Assertion, you do not shew.

Ibid. Your Repetitions indeed have been troublesome unto me. I grant here more than you desire, *viz.* That not only to morrow there will be Condemnation to him that shall not sincerely obey, but even to day there is condemnation to him; his Faith being not prompt and ready to bring forth the Fruit of Obedience, is not such as doth justifie him at all. But though Faith, whereby we are justified, must and will shew it self by Works, yet we are not therefore justified by Works as well as by Faith. *Paul* doth exclude Works, as well from Justification afterward as at first, *viz.* as concurring with Faith unto the Effect of Justifying: for he shews that *Abraham* was justified, not only at first, but also afterward, by Faith and not by Works, *Rom.* 4. 2, 3. And *James* doth require Works as well to Justification at first as afterward, *viz.* as Fruits of that Faith whereby we are justified. For otherwise he saith it is a dead Faith, ineffectual and unprofitable. Though Works do not presently appear upon our first believing, yet if they do not appear in due season, that Faith doth not justifie: Such a Believer doth not cease to be, but indeed never was in Christ, *viz.* as a justified Person is in him.

Ibid. How is Justification at Judgment a declaring of a Righteousness in question? The Word of God (the truth whereof is unquestionable) assures us that all true Believers are justified. And that such and such were true Believers, God by his Word and Spirit did evidence unto them before, though then he will make it more fully evident unto all! That Satan shall publickly accuse at the Last Judgment, is more than I see either Scripture or Reason for. He shall then be judged himself, and that in some sort by the Saints, 1 *Cor.* 6. 3. He shall then have little courage to accuse the Saints, though now he doth it.

Yet I question also whether Satan do at any time directly put up unto God any Accusations against the Saints. He seems to be called *the Accuser of the Brethren*, *Apoc.* 12. 10.* because by his Instruments he is ever * traducing and slandering them. He is said to accuse them, ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, before God, or in the sight of God; not τῷ Θεῷ, unto God, as the unjust Steward was accused to his Master, διεβλήθη αὐτῷ, *Luk.* 16. 1. That in

* See Mr. *Mede* on the place.

in *Job* 1. & 2. seems to be parabolically expressed. Satan knows his Accusations against the Saints to be false: Therefore he knows it is to little purpose to accuse them unto God. Especially at the Last Judgment, by the very separating of the Elect from the Reprobate, he will see that it is in vain to bring any Accusation against the Elect: and therefore how there should then be any such publick Accuser, or any question of the Righteousness of the Saints, I do not see: besides, that excepting those who will be found alive at Christ's coming, all have received their doom before, though not so openly as then they shall. That Obedience is a Condition of Glorification, not of right unto it, but of possession and enjoyment of it, I here and every-where confess.

1. What mean you by those words, [*Doth Obedience get Faith?*] Doth any such thing follow, upon that which I say? But you say, [*If Obedience only manifest Faith, how then doth it procure Right?*] *Ibid.* & 78.

Answ. It is not said, That Obedience doth procure right, but only thus much is signified, That none can have right without Obedience, as the Fruit of that Faith by which right is procured. As I said before of Works, so I say now of keeping the Commandments, (which doth comprehend in it all good Works) it is spoken of only as a Fruit of Faith, which Faith indeed doth (Instrumentally and Relatively) procure Right.

For the words of *James* I have said enough before; I have neither list nor leisure to repeat the same things continually upon every occasion. What your multitude of other Texts is, I do not know; but if they be not more forced, than by my Opinion the words of *James* are, there will be little cause to complain of the forcing of them.

2. That Faith without Obedience doth give right at first, you grant: The same right (I hold) is still continued only by Faith; though Faith, if not of such a Nature as to produce Obedience, can neither give right at first, nor afterward continue it. Though Repentance must go before Justification, yet Faith alone may justifie, and so give right; which though it be not the same with Justifying, yet it is necessarily joined with it.

3. *Jus in re*, I take to be such a Right, as from which the Possession it self is not, nor can be separated.

4. The Text doth not ascribe *Jus ad rem* to Obedience, but only *Declarativè*: as a Fruit of Faith it maketh it appear, that there is such a Right which Faith hath procured.

5. I do indeed believe, That a Man may have, and hath *Jus ad Gloriam* without Obedience, even as he is justified without Obedience. For certainly as soon as a Man is justified, he hath *Jus ad Gloriam*. For what doth hinder but sin, the guilt of which by Justification is done away? Yet still I say, Faith which doth justifie, and so gives right to Glory, will shew it self by Obedience. Those words [*If he live to Age*] are needless: for we speak continually of the Justification of such as are of Age. But how can you seriously ask me this Question, when your self put it out of all question, holding that a Man (that is of Age, I presume) is at first justified, and consequently (as I think you will not deny) hath *Jus ad Gloriam*, by Faith without Obedience?

6. It is no debasing of Faith to say, That after it, as a Fruit of it, Obedience is required to give *Jus in re*, *i. e.* to bring into the actual possession of Glory. How can you pretend this to be a debasing of Faith, who debase it much more in making it unsufficient to give *Jus ad rem*, except there be Obedience concurrent with it? Though yet herein you do not keep fair correspondence with your self, without a distinction of *Jus Inchoatum*, and *Jus Continuatum*; which distinction how it will hold good, I do not see.

78. If any shall think that you have said enough to prove, That we are justified by a Personal Righteousness, I shall think that such are soon satisfied

Ibid. 1. When we speak of Justification, we speak of it as taking off all Accusation, and as opposed to all Condemnation. And what Righteousness is sufficient for this, but that which is perfect?

2. That *Lud. de Dieu* hath not the same Doctrine on *Rom.* 8. 4. as you deliver, I have sufficiently shewed before: And if he had, I take the Authority of *Calvin* and *Davenant* (whom I cited, and to whom many others might be added) to be of more force against it, than *de Dieus*

Dieu's could be for it. That Holineſs and Obedience is neceſſary unto Salvation, ſo that no Salvation is to be expected without it, it were pitty (as I ſaid in the *Animadverſions*) any ſhould deny: but to argue from Salvation to Juſtification, Dr. *Fulk* told the *Rhemiſts*, is Pelting Sophiſtry: Yet you ſeem to wonder that I make a great difference between the Condition of Juſtification, and the Condition of Salvation. As for Right to Salvation that's another thing: as Faith alone doth juſtifie, ſo it alone gives Right to Salvation: Yet becauſe this Faith is of a working Nature, therefore before the actual Enjoyment of Salvation, Faith, as occaſion doth require, will ſhew it ſelf by Obedience; and that is all which the Apoſtle teacheth *Rom.* 8. 13. On *Jam.* 2. 24.

Verum eſt quidem (ſaith *Calvin*) *nos ſolâ Dei miſericordiâ juſtificari in Chriſto: ſed aquè & iſtud verum ac certum, omnes qui juſtificantur vocari à Domino, ut dignè ſuâ vocatione vivant.* *Ad Loc.*

It is true, He that proved a Man lived not after the fleſh, but mortified it, doth juſtifie him from that Accuſation, That he is worthy of Death: but that is only, becauſe a Man's not living after the fleſh, but mortifying it, proves the truth of his Faith, whereby he hath intereſt in Chriſt, and ſo is freed from all Condemnation, as the Apoſtle clearly ſheweth *Rom.* 8. 1. If that be a *Reatus* to make Faith only the Condition of Juſtification, yet Obedience alſo a Condition of Glorification. I ſay with the Oratour, *Quod maximè accuſatori optandum eſt, habes confitentem reum:* But what *Reatus* there is in this, I do not ſee, nor could our choiceſt Divines (it ſeems) ſee any in it.

River ſaith, that *Opera ſequuntur Juſtificationem, ſed præcedunt Glorificationem*; the words were cited more at large before. *Colleg. Controverſ. Diſp.* 36.

So *Ameſius*; *Nos non negamus bona opera ullam relationem ad ſalutem habere: habent enim relationem adjuncti conſequentis, & effecti ad ſalutem (ut loquuntur) adeptam, & adjuncti antecedentis ac diſponentis ad ſalutem adipiſcendam.* *Contra Bellar. tom. 4. l. 6. c. 6. in initio.*

Thus alſo *Davenant*, (*De Juſtit. Actual. cap.* 32. *ſub initio*;) *Verum eſt, nos negare bona opera requiri, ut Conditiones Salutis noſtræ, ſi per bona opera intelliga-*

mus exactè bona, & quæ Legis rigori respondeant: si etiam per Conditiones salutis intelligamus Conditiones fœderis, quibus recipimur in favorem Dei, & ad jus (N.B.) æternæ vitæ. Hæc enim pendent ex solâ conditione fidei Christum Mediatorem apprehendentis. At falsum est, nos negare bona opera requiri, ut Conditiones salutis, si per bona opera intelligamus illos fructus inchoatæ justitiæ, quæ sequuntur justificationem, & (N.B.) præcedunt glorificationem, ut via ordinata ad eandem.

What some Divines in their private Contests with you may do I know not; I shew what eminent Divines in their publick Writings do deliver, even the same that I maintain, *viz.* That Faith alone is the Condition of Justification, and of right to Salvation and Glory: and yet that Works are also requisite as the Fruits of that Faith, and as making way for the actual enjoyment of Glory.

For the term [*Instrument*], I was not willing to wrangle about it, neither am I willing to strive about words. Yet I told you, I thought it might well enough be used as our Divines do use it. And I always let you know, That thô perhaps Faith may more fitly be called a Condition, yet not so as to make it to be merely *Causa sine quâ non*, but so as to ascribe some Causality and Efficiency unto it in respect of Justification, *viz.* in that it apprehendeth and receiveth Christ's Righteousness; by which through Faith imputed unto us we are justified.

Of the Coven. c.6. p.70.

[*Faith* (saith Mr. *Ball*) *is not a bare Condition, without which the thing cannot be,* (*for that is no cause at all*) *but an Instrumental Cause*, &c.]

This (as you might see by many Passages) is the very reason why (I think) the Scripture doth attribute Justification to Faith alone, and not to Works, nor any other Grace besides Faith; because only Faith doth embrace Christ and his Righteousness. Though therefore I neither was, nor am willing λογομαχειν, yet I neither did, nor do disclaim the word [*Instrument*] as unmeet to be used.

And indeed seeing Faith hath some Causality in Justifying, what Cause it should be rather than Instrumental, I do not know.

Hear

Hear Mr. *Ball* again, if you please, [*If when we speak of the Conditions of the Covenant of Grace, by Condition we understand whatsoever is required on our part, as precedent, concomitant, and subsequent to Justification, Repentance, Faith and Obedience are all Conditions: but if by Condition we understand what is on our part required as the Cause of the good promised, though only Instrumental, Faith or Belief in the Promise is the only Condition*]. Of the Coven. c. 3. p. 20.

And again; [*Faith is a necessary and lively Instrument of Justification, which is among the number of true Causes, not being a Cause without which the thing is not done, but a Cause whereby it is done. The Cause without which a thing is not done, is only present in the action, and doth nothing therein; but as the Eye is an active Instrument for Seeing, and the Ear for Hearing; so is Faith also for Justifying. If it be demanded whose Instrument it is? It is the Instrument of the Soul, wrought therein by the Holy Ghost, and is the free Gift of God*]. Ibid. p. 19.

So *Amesius* when *Bellarmine* objected; *Sacramenta promissiones applicant, & nostras faciunt! non ergo per modum instrumenti applicantis fides sola justificat.* Contra Bell. tom. 4 lib. 5. c. 4. ad 11.

He answers; *Sola tamen ex iis, quæ sunt in nobis, vel à nobis erga Deum: sola fides accipiendo: quia Sacramenta sunt à Deo erga nos, & Promissionem applicant, ut instrumenta dandi, non accipiendi.*

Thus then is Faith taken for an Instrument of Justification, in that by Faith we receive the Promise, or Christ promised, by whom we are justified.

Bellarmine again objecting; *Hoc non multum refert: nam utrumque est instrumentum Dei.*

He answers; *Plurimum refert, quia sicut Sacramenta quamvis aliquo sensu possint dici instrumenta nostra, quatenus per illa tanquam per media assequimur finem nostrum, propriè tamen sunt instrumenta Dei: sic etiam Fides, quamvis possit vocari instrumentum Dei, quia Deus justificat nos ex fide & per fidem*, Rom. 3. 20. *propriè tamen est instrumentum nostrum. Deus nos baptizat, & pascit, non nosmetipsi; nos credimus in Christum, non Deus.*

If you desire more to this purpose, besides what hath been said before, I refer you to Mr. *Blake* of the Cove-

nant, *chap.* 12. and Mr. *Kendal* against Mr. *Goodwin*, chap. 4.

79. 1. The non-fulfilling of the Condition of the New-Covenant doth condemn, yet it is by the Law, and for the transgressing of it that any are condemned; there being no freedom from Condemnation, but by the New-Covenant, nor any by it without fulfilling the Condition of it. Such as do not embrace the New-Covenant, and that on the terms upon which it is made, are left to the Condemnation of the Old-Covenant, which will be so much the sorer, as the Sin in despising the Mercy offered is the greater. So that still (as I said in the *Animadversions*) the fulfilling of the Law, *viz.* Christ's fulfilling it for us, is that by which we are justified, though Faith be required of us, that Christ's fulfilling of the Law may be imputed unto us, and so we may be justified by it.

The Accusations which you speak of, *viz.* 1. Of not fulfilling the Condition of the New-Covenant. 2. Of having therefore no part in Christ. 3. Of being guilty moreover of far sorer punishment.

All these Accusations (as I have often said) are but a re-inforcing of that Accusation, That we are guilty of transgressing the Law, and so to be condemned; and therefore the more guilty, and the more to be condemned, because freedom from that Guilt and Condemnation might have been obtained, and was neglected; see *Acts* 13. 38, 41. *Heb.* 2. 3.

2. The Gospel doth not joyn Obedience with Faith as the Condition of our right unto Salvation, though it require Obedience as a Fruit of that Faith, whereby we obtain that Right, and so as the way or means whereby to enter into the actual enjoyment of Salvation.

3. You might see that I do not yeeld the Thesis, wherein you make Faith and Obedience so to be Conditions of the New-Covenant, as withal to be Conditions of Justification: This both now and every-where I deny.

Ibid. 1. If it be not much (as you say) to your purpose; Why do you alledg it? That Christ did not receive either of the Sacraments for that end as we receive them, who can question?

2. If you judg it uncertain, whether *Luke* or *Matthew*

them did relate those words, [*I will not drink hence-forth, &c.*] out of due place, why are you so peremptory in your *Aphorisms* as to say, [*Luke doth clearly speak of two Cups, and doth subjoin these words to the first, which was before the Sacramental*]?

3. Why do you call that Supposition, [*If* Luke *had not written*] a merry one? Is it ridiculous to suppose such a thing?

Let us suppose (says Mr. *Cawdrey* and Mr. *Palmer*) *that Question had not been put to our Saviour, and that the Apostle had not written his Epistle to the* Ephesians, *&c.*] Of the Sabbath, Part 2. c. 6. p. 227.

May not one as well sport with this Supposition of theirs, as you with that of mine? *Luke* himself shews, That he wrote his Gospel after others, *Luk.* 1. 1. Probable it is, that he wrote after *Matthew* and *Mark*: And how should any reading only these, imagine that those words [*I will not drink*, &c.] were meant of any other than the Sacramental Cup, they not making mention (no not in appearance) of any other?

Apud Matthæum (*inquit* Amef.) *26. 29. pronomen istud demonstrativum*, [*ex hoc fructu vitis*] *necessariò refertur ad illud, quod precedentibus verbis fuit eodem pronomine demonstratum*, [*Hoc est sanguis meus*]. Contra Bellar. Tom. 3. l. 4. c. 1. §. 48.

Though *Matthew* and *Mark* had not written, yet it had been no such boldness to suppose *Luke* to relate some words out of that order wherein they were spoken, such Anticipations (as I said, and you do not gain-say it) being usual in the Scripture.

Thus again *Amesius*; *Ex ipso* Luca (*quamvis ibi transponantur verba*) *contrà colligitur aperte, illa verba pertinere ad Calicem Mysticum & Sacramentalem Cœnæ Domini. Nam cap. 22. 17. dicitur Dominus gratias egisse super illud poculum, in quo dicit fructum vitis posteà manssisse, eodem modo quo* v. 19. *gratias egit super panem. Hâc autem gratiarum actione intelligi benedictionem & Consecrationem Sacramentalem concedit* Bellarminus, *cap.* 10. &c. Ib d.

1. It is such a Justification, as the Apostle where he doth professedly treat of that Subject, doth scarce ever mention: nor yet do Divines use to speak of it. Therefore your [*totus Mundus Theologorum Reformatorum*], Ibid. & 80.

is

is *Vox, præterea nihil.* Why do you alledge none of them? *Juris consultos enim in hâc causâ minùs moror.* But and if we maintain the word [*Justification*] is taken *in sensu forensi*; What of that? May it not yet nevertheless be as I suppose it is, *viz.* That Justification at the Last Judgment is only a full manifestation of that Justification which we have here, and not (as you affirm) our actual, most proper and compleat Justification, as if here our Justification were but potential, less proper and incompleat?

Medul. lib. 1. c. 27. §. 7. *Amesius* handling this Point, saith, *Justificatio est sententiæ pronuntiatio, & non physicam aliquam aut realem commutationem denotat in S. literis, sed forensem aut moralem illam, quæ in Sententiæ pronuntiatione & reputatione consistit.*

Yet he hath nothing at all (that I see) of Justification at the Great Judgment; much less that it is the actual, most proper and compleat Justification.

Ibid. § 9. He saith moreover; *Sententia hæc fuit*; 1. *in mente Dei quasi concepta per modum decreti justificandi.* 2. *Fuit in Christo capite nostro à mortuis jam resurgente pronuntiata.* 3. *Virtualiter pronuntiatur ex primâ illa relatione, quæ ex fide ingeneratâ exurgit.* 4. *Expressè pronunciatur per Spiritum Dei testantem Spiritibus nostris reconciliationem nostram cum Deo.* — *In hoc testimonio Spiritus non tam propriè ipsa justificatio consistit, quàm actualis anteâ concessa perceptio, per actum fidei quasi reflexum.*

But as for the pronouncing of this Sentence at the Last Judgment, he doth not so much as make any mention of it. Neither doth *Calvin* (that I find) in his Institutions, though he treat at large of Justification, and that *in sensu forensi*, speak any thing of Justification at the Last Judgment; nor indeed any that I meet with, except it be on the by, as *Bucanus* and *Maccovius*, who agree with me, as I have shewed before.

2. If the Fruits of Faith be inquired after, That so Faith may appear true and genuine, such as doth indeed receive Christ, and so justifie; Is not this a sufficient reason why they are inquired after? But in that which follows about *via ad Regnum, &c.* you are quite *extra viam.* You forget that we are now about Justification; or

or at least that I do not make the Condition of Justification and of Salvation every way the same as you sometimes do. This may suffice for your two first Objections.

To the Third and Fourth, I answer in the words of that Reverend and Learned *Davenant*; *Particula* [*Enim*] *non semper rei causam denotat, sed illationis consequentiam, sive à causa, sive ab effecto, sive à signo, seu undecunque petitam*; — *Sic quando Christus dicit electis, Venite benedicti, &c. Esurivi enim, &c. particula ilia non cum causâ salutis, sed cum signo causæ connectitur. Nam illa bona opera, quæ ibi recensentur, sunt signa veræ fidei, adoptionis, insitionis in Christum, prædestinationis ac favoris divini, quæ sunt veræ causæ salutis.* *De Justit. Habit. cap. 32. ad Object. 9.*

Maccovius *de Justific. Disp.* 10. *Justificatur quis ex operibus apud Deum non justificatione causæ, sed justificatione effecti & signi.*

You are therefore too free and forward in saying, That the Uses pretended for this enquiring after mere Signs are frivolous. What though the business at Judgment be to enquire of the Cause, and to sentence accordingly? May not the Cause (take it in the Law-sense) be made to appear by Signs, even as the Cause (in the Logical-sense) doth appear by the Effect, and the Tree by the Fruit? That Obedience is *ipsa Causa, de quâ quæritur*, the terms [*Therefore*] and [*Because*] do not prove, no more than the term [*For*]. And here I may with better reason say than you did, *Appello totum Mundum Theologorum Reformatorum.*

But here I must mind you of one thing, which (it seems) you do not observe, *viz.* That those terms which you build upon, [*Because*] and [*Therefore*] are neither in the Original, nor any Translation (that I know) except the Vulgar Latin, which hath *Quia*.

Bellarmine urging these Particles, *Amesius* answers, *Mat.* 25. 21, 23. *Nulla particula reperitur nisi in Versione non probanda. Contra* Bellar. *Tom.* 4. *lib.* 7. *cap.* 2. *ad* 3.

1. You cite abundance of Texts, but to what purpose? You would have me try whether they speak only of Signs, or or Conditions. Conditions of what do you mean? Of Justification? That you are to prove: but how 80.

how it can be proved by any of those Texts, I cannot see. They speak of the necessity of Obedience unto Salvation, of God's rendring unto Men according to their Deeds, of the reward of good Works, &c. But doth it therefore follow, that Obedience and good Works are Conditions of Justification? I am loth to be so plain with you, as sometimes you are with me, otherwise I could say, I have seldom seen so many places of Scripture alledged to so little purpose. Some of those places you seem to lay more weight upon, as *John* 16. 27. and 2 *Cor.* 5. 10. and 1 *John* 3. 22, 23. For here you do not only note the places, but you also cite the words, as if they were more especially to be observed.

Now for that *Joh.* 16. 27. [*The Father hath loved you, because you have loved me*]; What do you inter from thence? That Works justifie as part of the Condition of Justification? If this be a good Consequence, I may say, *Reddat mihi minam qui me docuit Dialecticam.*

1. Works and Love differ as well as Works, though Works flow both from Love and Faith.

In Loc. *Calvin* makes those words [*because you have loved me*], to denote an unfeigned Faith, which proceedeth from a sincere Affection, here called Love. And I grant that such a Love, *viz.* of Desire doth go before Justifying Faith.

3. God doth love those that love him, and that love Christ, *amore amicitiæ*; yet *amore benevolentiæ*, he loves us before we love him, 1 *Joh.* 4. 10, 19.

Ibid. *Secundum hanc rationem* (*inquit* Calvinus) *hîc dicimur amari à Deo, dum Christum diligimus, quia pignus habemus paternæ ejus dilectionis*, &c.

That in 2 *Cor.* 5. 10. [*according to*, &c.] avails your Cause nothing. For may not Works be considered at the Last Judgment, so as that we shall receive according to them, and yet be no part of the Condition of Justification, but only Fruits of that Faith whereby we are justified? So for that in *Joh.* 3. 22. [*because we keep his Commandments*, &c.]

In Loc. I say with *Calvin*; *Non intelligit fundatam esse in operibus nostris orandi fiduciam; sed in hoc tantùm insistit, non posse à fide disjungi pietatem, & sincerum Dei cultum.*

cultum. Nec absurdum videri debet, quod particulam Causalem (N. B.) usurpet, utcunque de causâ non disputetur. Nam accidens inseparabile interdum Causæ loco poni solet. Quemadmodum si quis dicat, Quia Sol Meridie supra nos lucet, plus tunc esse caloris. Neque enim sequitur ex luce oriri calorem.

1. You shall confound Justification and Salvation, betwixt which (you know) I make a great difference. *Ibid.*

2. I see not that any of the Texts alledged do prove Obedience to be concurrent with Faith unto Justification, or to Right to Salvation. Obedience is an Argument *à posteriore* of our Right unto Salvation, and *à priore* a means of our enjoyment of it. More than this by any Text of Scripture (I presume) will not be proved.

Your First and Second have nothing but mere Words. *Ibid.*

Ad 3. I answer, No more is the word [*Justification*] in any of the Texts which you cited.

Ad 4. What trick do you mean? Or what prejudice? Do you so wonder at this, That I cannot be perswaded by any of your Allegations, that we are justified by our personal Righteousness? Or that Works concur with Faith unto Justification, as being part of the Condition that the Gospel doth require, that thereby we may be justified? Then all Protestant Divines are Men to be wondred at, or at least never considered the Texts, which you alledg; and surely that were a great wonder.

Ad 5. For Justification at Judgment, I will say no more until I see more proof of your Opinion about it.

Ad 6. The Qualifications spoken of tend to that end, That we may enjoy Salvation, but not that we may have right to Salvation: They only manifest that Right, which by Faith in Christ we do obtain.

Ad 7. Of *James* his words enough already.

Ad 8. I wish you were more Argumentative, and less Censorious, or at least more wary in expressing your censure. To say [*It is next to non-sense*] is over-broad; If you had said, That you could see no good sense in it, this had not been so much, as truly I cannot in your words. For may not a thing be spoken by way of Sentence, and yet by way of Argumentation too? I think, Yes, when a reason is given of the Sentence. But what

should

should that in *Luke* 19. 17. force me to confess? That Works are more than Fruits of Faith, by which we are justified?

Why do you stand so much upon the word [*Because*], when-as you acknowledg that Works are no proper cause? May it not be said, [This is a good Tree, because it bringeth forth good Fruit?] and yet the goodness of the Tree is before the goodness of its Fruit; and this is but only a manifestation of the other. So what should I see in *Luk.* 19. 27? That none should be saved by Christ, but such as are obedient unto him, that I see; but not that Obedience is that whereby we are (at least in part) justified. Yea, I think it worthy your consideration, That the Texts which you alledg and build upon, speaking only of Works and Obedience, and not of Faith at all, either must be interpreted, That Obedience and Works are necessary Fruits of Justifying Faith, or else they will reach further than you would have them, even to make Obedience and Works the only Condition of Justification at Judgment.

Ad 9. Where you performed that, I know not: But however your Work was not to overthrow any Arguments for Merits, (for which I am far from urging) but to answer my reason, which I urged, why those Scriptures which you alledged, might rather seem to make Works meritorious of Salvation, than to concur with Faith unto Justification, *viz.* because they follow Justification, but go before Salvation. I know you will say, That they go before Justification as Continued and Consummate at Judgment: but for the overthrowing of that, I need say no more till you say more in defence of it.

81. The Texts which you alledg speak only of Obedience: and so if you will think to prove by them, That Obedience is the Condition of our Justification; you may as well say, That it is the only Condition, and so quite exclude Faith, which is not mentioned in those Texts. If you say, It is in other Texts; so (say I) do other Texts shew that Faith is the only Condition, and that Obedience is not concurrent with Faith unto Justification, though it necessarily flow from that Faith by which we are justified. That may be alledged as the reason of the Justifying Sentence, which yet is but the Fruit and Effect

of

of Justifying Faith. If *Sententia* be *Præmii Adjudicato*, then (I think) *Causa Sententiæ* must be also *Causa Præmii adjudicati*. The word [*For*], when we say [*Justified for Faith*], must note either the formal, or the meritorious Cause: the *ratio Sententiæ* may be drawn from that, which is neither the formal nor the meritorious Cause of Justification, nor yet a Condition or Instrument of it, but only a Fruit and Effect of that which is so.

3. The Scripture doth not say, That Works do justifie us in that sense as you take it, *viz.* as joint Conditions with Faith of Justification.

4. I think it not so proper to say, [We must be judged, and receive our Reward by our Works] as [according to our Works]. And however, to be judged by our Works, is not as much as to be justified by them, otherwise than as they are Fruits and Effects of Faith, and so manifest our Interest in Christ, by whom all that believe are justified, *Acts* 13. 39.

5. Your [*For*] must needs be the same with [*Propter*]. When you say, [*We are justified for Faith*] surely in Latin it must be *propter Fidem*. Here [*enim*] will not be suitable.

1. That which I intimated is this, That in respect of God, such an outward judicial Proceeding needed not, no more than God doth need a Sign. Whether the Judicial Proceeding be all upon mere Signs, and the *Ipsa Causa Justitiæ* not meddled with, is not to the purpose. Though why may not that which is in some respect *Justitia Causæ*, and so *Justitia Personæ quoad istam Causam*, be *Signum Fidei*, *& per consequens Justitiæ Christi nobis per Fidem imputatæ, qua simpliciter & absolutè justificamur*? *Ibid.*

2. and 3. That which is the Condition of Glorification, is not therefore the Condition of Justification, or of right to Glorification, which doth immediately flow from Justification, or at least is inseparably joined with it. No Man can be accused to be *Reus Pœnæ*, and so to have no right to Glorification; but he that is accused to be *Reus Culpæ*: and from that Accusation we are justified by Faith, which is made manifest by our Works.

1. I perceive I did mistake your meaning, the contexture *Ibid.*

ture of your words being such, that one might easily mistake the meaning of them.

2. Your Affirmation is no Proof; and as well may you say, That because in other places of Scripture the Righteous are usually spoken of in respect of Personal Righteousness, in opposition to the wicked and ungodly, therefore all those places prove, That Personal Righteousness is that whereby we are justified. Because we must have a Righteousness inherent in us, as well as a Righteousness imputed to us: are we therefore justified as well by the one as the other? *Appello Evangelium pariter ac totum Mundum Theologorum Reformatorum.*

Ibid. & 82. 1. Your *Aphorisms* tend to prove Justification by Works, to which end you press the words of St. *James*, and reject the Interpretation which our Divines give of them.

2. *Paul* indeed and *James* did not consider Works in the same sense. For *Paul* considered them as concurring with Faith unto Justification, and so rejected them: but *James* looked at them as Fruits of Justifying-Faith, and so asserted the necessity of them. You do not rightly understand *Paul*'s words, *Rom.* 4. 4. of which I have spoken before. He doth not speak absolutely; for so he should quite abolish Works, which in other places he doth maintain and plead for, as without which we must not think to be saved: but he speaks in reference to Justification, and so he excludes Works even for this very reason, because they cannot justifie, except they be meritorious, and such as that the reward of them is of debt, and not of Grace, *viz.* pardoning Grace; for otherwise whatever reward the Creator doth bestow upon the Creature, it is of Grace. Yet it doth not therefore follow that Faith is meritorious, because we are justified by Faith. For Faith doth justifie Relatively, in respect of Christ's Righteousness, which it apprehendeth, and by which so apprehended we are justified: but so Works cannot justifie; they must either justifie for their own worth, or not at all, save only *Declarativè*, by manifesting our Faith, and so our Justification. See Mr. *Ball* of the Coven. *c.* 3. *p.* 19. & *c.* 6. *p.* 69, 70.

Ubi (inquit) Sunt ejusmodi, illis deb tum præmium expenditur quod datur fidei, gratuitum est. Calvin. *Instit. lib.* 3. *c.* 11. §. 18. *vide ibid. plura.*

1. The

1. The Scriptures do plainly so distinguish, as to deny Working, that thereby we may be justified, *Rom.* 3. 28. and 4. 5. Yet to asser, Working, that thereby we may be saved, *Phil.* 2. 12. You will say, That the former places speak of Meritorious and Legal Working. 82.

But, 1. All Working which is good, is Legal, as I have shewed before, *i. e.* according to the Rule and Prescript of the Law, even Gospel-Obedience is in that respect Legal. And when the Apostle doth exclude the Deeds of the Law from Justification, he doth not mean (as some take it) Deeds done by the Power of the Law, without Grace, but Deeds which the Law doth prescribe however done. For he denies that *Abraham* was justified by his Works; yet doubtless they were not done without Grace.

The Apostle taketh it as granted, That all Works whereby we are justified, are meritorious: for if there be no meritoriousness in them, he supposeth there is no being justified by them. For indeed how can Working justifie, if there be any defect and failing in it? Therefore Faith it self doth not justifie in respect of it self, but in respect of Christ whom it apprehendeth. See *Calvin Inst. lib.* 3. *cap.* 11. §. 7. the words were before-cited.

To your Second; I have always denied that there is the same reason of Salvation (*viz.* compleat) and Justification; and have always held, That Justification at Judgment is but a manifestation of our present Justification.

To your Third; None is *Reus Pœnæ*, except he be *Reus Culpæ*; and there is no *Reatus Culpæ*, but by transgressing the Law, though it may be aggravated, and so the other, by the Gospel. But properly the not-fulfilling of the Condition of the Gospel, taking it merely as a Condition, and not as a Duty, doth not bring a new Guilt, but only leaves a Man in the old Guilt, with an aggravation of it, he having no benefit of the Gospel to free him from his Guilt, and being the more deeply guilty, in that he neglected the Mercy which he might have obtained.

Ibid. 1. Some of your words (I confeſs) I do not underſtand, nor can I ſee what reference they have to mine in the *Animadverſions*. But when you ſpeak of Right to Juſtification and Salvation, you ſeem to mean Sentential Juſtification at Judgment. For elſe we have here Juſtification it ſelf, and not only a right unto it, though we have only a right to Salvation, and not Salvation it ſelf; I mean in reſpect of the fulneſs and perfection of it. And though Juſtification and Salvation flow from the ſame Covenant, yet there is more required unto Salvation, than unto Juſtification by that Covenant: and ſo you alſo hold in reſpect of your firſt Juſtification.

2. You trouble your ſelf more than needs with your Diſtinctions, which (as you do uſe them) do but involve the Matter in more obſcurity. Surely my words of themſelves, [Freedom from all ſin in reſpect of imputation, and from all condemnation for ſin] are far more perſpicuous, than when you ſo multiply Diſtinctions to find out (forſooth) the meaning of them. For, 1. Is not [Freedom] more plain than [Liberation ?] though they both ſignifie the ſame thing. 2. Can there be an Active Liberation without a Paſſive, or a Paſſive without an Active ? If God free us, are we not freed ? And if we be freed, doth not God free us ? What need then to diſtinguiſh in that manner ? If freedom relate to God, it is Active; if to us, it is Paſſive. And what difference betwixt Liberation, or Freedom, (*viz.* from the Imputation of Sin, and Condemnation for Sin) and Abſolution ?

3. The Reprobate are *Condemnati per ſententiam Judicis*, Joh. 3. 18. *etiamſi ſententia publica prolatio, ejuſque plena executio in ultimum uſque diem ſit dilata.*

4. Not only right to Abſolution, but Abſolution it ſelf is perfect to a Believer through Chriſt, *Rom.* 8. 1. Neither are there any more Conditions of Juſtification at any time than Faith: though more ſins be every day committed, and ſo more are to be pardoned, yet ſtill Faith as well afterward as at firſt doth procure the pardon of them, without Works, as therein concurrent with it.

Non

Non aliam Justitiam (saith *Calvin*) *ad finem usque vitæ habent fideles, quàm quæ illic* (*nempe* Rom. 4. & 2 Cor. 5.) *describitur.* *Instit. l. 3. c. 14. §. 11.*

5. Actual Absolution, and Judicial *per sententiam Judicis*, is in this life, and that perfect, though there be not a perfect declaration of it till the Last Judgment.

6. When you say, [*Condemnation is not perfect, if any at all, till the Last Judgment*], you do in effect question whether there be any Justification till then. For if no Condemnation, then no Justification. But Condemnation * (I say) is perfect here, though the Sentence be not publickly pronounced, and fully executed till hereafter.

* *I speak of the Reprobate, who neither do, nor ever shall believe.*

7. I do not speak of freedom from all sin as the Antinomians do, as if God did see no sin in his Children, and they had no sin to be humbled for: but I say, That God doth not impute sin unto them, so as to condemn them for it. And so much surely the Scripture doth say, if I understand it, 2 *Cor.* 5. 19. *Rom.* 8. 1. For freedom from future sins, I have said enough before.

8. The word [Justification] may be used *in sensu Judiciario*, (as I have shewed before) and yet Justification at Judgment be but a manifestation of our present Justification. Your Quotations out of the *Civilians* are not against me, for I say, *Sententia Judicis jam lata est, etiamsi in extremo demum die plenè publicéque sit revelanda.* I speak also of an Authoritative Manifestation; and therefore your Instance of a Woman manifesting a Felony, *&c.* is not to the purpose.

Obedience as a Fruit of Faith is necessary, both *necessitate præcepti*, so that it is sin to omit it; and also *necessitate medii*, so that we cannot be saved without it. But if it be a Means, (say you) then it is a Condition. Well, but a Means and a Condition (say I) of what? Of Salvation? It is granted. Of Justification? It is denied, neither doth this follow upon the other. 83.

Taking Christ for Lord is virtually included in taking him for Priest; see *Rom.* 14. 9. and 2 *Cor.* 5. 15. They cannot be divided, though they be distinguished. That *Ibid.*

Faith which receiveth Christ as Priest, doth also receive him as Lord, either expressly, if Christ be propounded as Lord, or at least implicitly: yet Faith only, as receiving Christ as Priest, doth justifie, for the reason alledged before, to which I see nothing that you have said of force to refel it. Wicked Men cannot unfeignedly receive Christ as Priest, whiles they retain a Heart standing out in rebellion against Christ as Lord. Can they indeed embrace Christ as satisfying for them, and yet not yeeld up themselves in obedience unto him?

The Apostle (it seems) was of another mind; [*The love of Christ* (saith he) *constraineth us. For we thus judg, That if one died for all, then were all dead: And that he died for all, that they which live, should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him that died for them, and rose again*]. 2 Cor. 5. 14, 15.

And again, [*I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live, I live by Faith in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me*], Gal. 2. 20.

This is the nature of that Faith which doth receive Christ as a Reconciler, to work through Love, *Gal.* 5. 6. May I not retort upon you, and say, When you have taught wicked Men, that Faith alone doth justifie at first, and they are willing to believe, will you perswade them that they are unjustified again, because Works do not follow after? For my part, I know no unjustifying of those who are once justified. You speak sometimes of being justified to day by Faith without Works, and of being unjustified to morrow, or the day after, except Works come in and help to justifie. But I say, Faith without a promptitude to Works doth not justifie at first; such as do not receive Christ as Lord, and do good Works, when there is opportunity, were never justified at all, they never had a true Justifying-Faith, which is never without Works, as the seasonable Fruits and Effects of it: Yet Faith both at first and last doth justifie without Works, as concurrent with it unto Justification. What you say of a willingness to receive Christ, is nothing. For I speak of a true actual receiving, which I say cannot be of Christ as Priest, except it be (either expressly or implicitly) of Christ as Lord also: and yet we are justified by receiving

him

him in the one respect, and not in the other. None can have that Faith which justifieth, but they shall have also other Graces and VVorks of Obedience in their season; Yet do not other Graces therefore, or VVorks justifie as well as Faith.

Bellarmine objecting; *Fides vera potest re ipsâ à dilectione separari.* *Contra Bellar.*

Amesius answers; *Aliqua fides potest; talis est Pontificia: sed illa fides, cui nos tribuimus justificandi virtutem, cum unionem faciat nostri cum Christo, à Christi Spiritu vivificante, & Sanctificante non potest separari.* *Tom. 4. lib. 5. c. 4. ad 8.*

Yet he saith; *Fides non justificat, ut respicit præcepta operum faciendorum, sed solummodo ut respicit promissionem gratiæ.* *Ibid. cap. 3. §. 6.*

So Dr. *Prideaux*; *Fides sola justificat, non ratione existentiæ, absque spe & charitate, sed muneris. Lect. 5. de Justif. §. 7.*

And Mr. *Ball* of the Coven. *c. 6. p. 73.* [Abraham *was justified by Faith alone; but this Faith, though alone in the Act of Justification, no other Grace co-working with it, was not alone in existence, did not lie dead in him, as a dormant and idle quality.* —— * *Works then (or a purpose to walk with God) justifie as the passive qualification of the Subject, capable of Justification, or as the qualification of that Faith which justifieth; or as they testifie or give proof that Faith is lively: but Faith alone justifieth, as it embraceth the promise of free forgiveness in Jesus Christ*]. * *Those words you alledg afterwards, but they are little to your purpose.*

Here by the way observe how *Amesius* and Mr. *Ball* speak of Faith apprehending and embracing the Promise; which manner of speech may also be observed in other eminent Divines, yet you somewhere censure Mr. *Cotton* somewhat sharply for speaking in that manner.

1. If it be as difficult for the Understanding to believe, (*i. e.* assent unto) Christ's Priestly Office, as is his Kingly, then it seems also as hard for the VVill to consent to, or accept of the one as the other. If the VVill be inclined to a thing, it will move the Understanding to assent unto it. *Quod valde volumus, facilè credimus.* That the Jews believed neither Christ's Kingly nor his *Ibid. & 84.*

Prieſtly Office, was the perverſneſs of their Will, as well as the error of their Underſtanding. What the Papiſts, with whom you have met, do ſay, matters little; we ſee what their great Rabbies ſay and maintain in their Diſputations. Yet it is no ſtrange thing, if even they alſo now and then let fall ſomething, wherein they give teſtimony to the Truth, though in the whole current of their Diſcourſes they oppoſe it.

Contra Bellar. Tom. 4. lib 6. c. 1. ad 22. *Ameſius* ſheweth, That *Bellarmine* in that very place which you cite, doth contradict himſelf, whiles he is overearneſt to contradict Proteſtants; *Bellarminus hîc implicat ſeipſum contradictione, ut nobis poſſit contradicere.*

Whereas you cite *Rivet* diſclaiming that which *Bellarmine* maketh to be the Opinion of Proteſtants, *viz.* That Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is the formal Cauſe of Juſtification, I have ſaid enough about it before, *viz.* That ſome underſtanding the Term one way, ſome another, our Divines expreſs themſelves variouſly; yet all agree in the thing it ſelf, *viz.* That Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, through Faith imputed unto us, is that by which we are juſtified; See *Davenant de Juſtit. Habit. cap.* 24. *ad* 5. where he anſwers this very Argument of *Bellarmine*, though he contract his words, and leave out thoſe which you cite; but however, both there, and in other places which I cited before, he hath enough to this purpoſe, concerning the formal Cauſe of Juſtification, and how the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed to us may be ſo termed.

Lect. 5. De Juſtif. §. 11. Dr. *Prideaux* alſo (I ſee) is offended at *Bellarmine* for ſaying, *Sed ita imputari nobis Chriſti juſtitiam, ut per eam formaliter juſti nominemur, & ſimus, id nos cum rectâ ratione pugnare contendimus*; as if this were the Opinion of Proteſtants.

At quis unquam è noſtris (ſaith the Doctor) *nos per juſtitiam Chriſti imputatam, formaliter juſtificari aſſeruit?*

But ſee how and in what ſenſe he doth diſclaim that Opinion; *Annon formam quamlibet inhærentem, quâ formaliter juſti denominemur, ſemper exploſimus?*

In this ſenſe alſo *Davenant* doth reject it; *Quod dicit* Bellarminus, *impoſſibile eſſe, ut, per juſtitiam Chriſti imputatam formaliter juſti ſimus, ſi per formaliter intelligat*

telligat inhærenter, nugas agit, atque tribuit illam ipsam sententiam Protestantibus, quam oppugnant. De Justit. Habit. cap. 24. ad 5. Yet in another sense he holds that Christ's Righteousness imputed to us, is the formal Cause of our Justification; the words were before cited.

And as others, so Dr. *Prideaux* speaks the very same thing, saying, *Justificamur per justitiam Christi, non personæ, quâ ipse est vestitus, sed meriti, quâ suos vestit, nobis imputatam.* *Ubi supra.*

But for the principal thing intended in this Section of yours, Though wicked Men may be more ready to receive Christ as their Justifier, than as their Ruler, (so you express it); yet it follows not, that the receiving of Christ as a Ruler, is that Act of Faith which doth justifie. For the difficulty of a thing is no good Argument to prove the necessity of it, either at all, or to such a purpose.

2. My second Note was to this purpose, quite to take away the force of your Argument, and so (I think) it doth notwithstanding your Reply. For have we not God's means to overcome that averseness of nature, if the receiving of Christ as Lord do necessarily follow Pardon, as well as if it be a Condition of Pardon? When I make it a Fruit of Justifying-Faith to take Christ for Lord, I do not say but that Christ may at once be received both as Priest and as Lord, and so must, if he be so propounded; I speak of express propounding and receiving: But my meaning is, That though we be justified by receiving Christ as Priest, perhaps not yet hearing of him (expressly) as Lord, yet that Justifying-Faith will also put forth it self to take Christ for Lord, when he is so set forth unto us. To be justified before we take Christ as Lord, is not to be justified before we take Christ as Christ. For Christ is Christ as Priest, though not only as Priest. Indeed to receive Christ in respect of one Office, so as to refuse him in respect of another, were not to receive Christ as Christ: but that is not the Case as I do put it. And for the moral necessity of taking Christ as Lord, which you ask what it is, if it be not a Condition: I suppose it may be morally necessary as a thing commanded, and yet be no Condition of Justification. For

can nothing be commanded, and so be morally necessary, but it must be commanded and be necessary to that end, that thereby we may be justified? Works are commanded, and so necessary, yet you hold them to be no Condition of our Justification at first, neither indeed are they afterward, as that of *Gen.* 15. 6. with *Rom.* 4. 2, 3. doth irrefragably prove.

Your Argument I thus retort, [He that is justified, is in a State of Salvation, and should be saved, if he so died. But he that hath Faith without VVorks, is justified; *Ergo*, he is in a State of Salvation, and if he so die, shall be saved]. Answer for your self as you please: for my part I say, The same Faith which receiveth Christ as Priest, and so justifieth, is ready also to receive Christ as Lord, when he is so propounded; even as that Faith, which justifieth, is ready to produce Works, when they are required.

84. 1. You should not only suppose, but prove, that the excluding of Obedience from Justification (as co-partner with Faith in justifying) is a Scandal given, and an Error.

2. If it were not *Paul*'s design to advance Faith above Love, *&c.* in point of Justification, what then means his so frequent asserting Faith to be that whereby we are justified, and his never-mentioning Love, *&c.* to that purpose?

3. Your self acknowledg an aptitude in Faith to justifie as apprehending Christ, and I acknowledg, that besides this God hath appointed Faith for that purpose, in respect of i s aptitude, making choice of it rather than of any other Grace.

Ibid. I have also oft enough considered what you have said. *Justificatio* (saith *Davenant*) *purgat, & abluit à reatu & pœnâ peccati, idque uno momento, & perfectè. De Justit. Habit. cap.* 23. *ad Arg.* 4.

Though Justification be perfect, as freeing from all Condemnation; yet so long as there may be Accusation, there is need of Justification. Whereas you speak of the Law justifying, *&c. It is God that justifieth*, Rom. 8. 33. though according to the Gospel or New-Covenant, (for

(for that, I presume, you mean by the Law) and by the imputation of Christ's Righteousness. Christ as our Advocate doth plead our Cause, and procure our Justification; and at the Last Judgment, as God's Vicegerent, he will publickly pronounce Sentence.

I see nothing against me, but that still you run upon this Supposition, That there is the same Condition of Salvation, and of Justification at Judgment, whereas I suppose that VVorks are a Condition of Salvation, as full and compleat, but not so of Justification at Judgment, that being but a manifestation of our present Justification, and so VVorks looked at but as Fruits and Evidences of Faith, whereby we are justified. If *Illyricus* his Doctrine were the same with this, his fellow-Protestants (I dare say) would not blame him for it. Neither do I see how *Illyricus* could, or any rational Man can grant VVorks to be necessary Fruits of Faith, and yet deny them to be means or Conditions of Salvation, in respect of the actual and full enjoyment of it. For surely as Faith it self is required that we may be justified, so the Fruits of Faith (to be produced in due season) are required that we may be glorified. But why do you thus still jumble together Justification and Salvation, saying, [Illyricus *his Error was in denying Works to be necessary to Justification and Salvation* ?] Yet when you cite *Bucer* and *Melancthon* as asserting the necessity of good VVorks, there is not a syllable in them about Justification, as if VVorks were necessary in that respect. *Ibid.* & 85.

Bucer in that Conference at *Ratisbon*, which you cite, though he maintain Inherent Righteousness, (as who doth not ?) yet he saith, *Hâc justitiâ nemo justificatur coram Deo justificatione vitæ*, as he is cited by *Lud. de Dieu* in *Rom.* 8. 4. *ubi plura vide.*

So *Melancthon* is cited by *Bellarmine* as holding with other Protestants of prime note, that, *Sola fides justificat, & tamen fides quæ justificat, non est sola.* *De Justif. lib.* 1 *c.* 14.

And *Wotton* saith, (*De Reconcil. Part* 2. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 19. *Num.* 4.) Lutherus, Melancthon, Calvinus, Chemnitius, *eâ potissimum causâ nos infusâ & inhærente justitiâ justificari non posse contendunt, quòd illa in nobis ita imperfecta sit, ut in Dei conspectum, quum ad judicandum*

candum accedat, prodire non audeat. But of *Bucer* and *Melanchthon* more by and by.

For *Illyricus*, what in other places he may hold I cannot tell, but in the Centuries (whereof he was the chief Author) he seems to agree with other prime Protestants; For he brings in 27 Arguments, whereby the Apostles (he saith) prove, *Hominem solâ fide absque operibus Legis justificari*; Among which the 23d is this; *Dua sunt tantum viæ ad salutem, & nulla est tertia, &c. Una harum est per opera Legis; altera est per fidem in Christum, qui pro nobis Legem implevit. Sed illa, quæ est per opera Legis, postulat à nobis integerrimam impletionem, quam quia nemo potest præstare, omnes damnantur à Lege. Ea verò quæ per fidem est, gratis propter opera Christi, donat justitiam & vitam credentibus. Qui ergò vult per opera salvari propria, is alteram viam tollit; & è contrà, qui vult per fidem salvari gratis, is non potest per opera sua justificari. Gal.* 5. (perhaps it should be *Gal.* 3.) *Rom.* 4. & 10. *Ephes.* 2.

Cent. 1. *lib.* 2. *c.* 4. *Col.* 253, *&c.*

Here he seems indeed to confound Justification and Salvation, as if there were the same reason of both, and Works were no more required unto Salvation than unto Justification. But surely by Salvation he meant a Right unto Salvation, which doth necessarily go along with Justification; and whatsoever it be that doth justifie, the same also doth give a right unto Salvation. For otherwise he makes Works and new Obedience necessary to the full enjoyment of Salvation.

For he treats at large *de novâ obedientiâ seu bonis operibus justificatorum*; and he goes through the several Commandments, and brings in a Catalogue of Good Works which are required in every Commandment.

Ibid. Col. 279, *&c.* *Ibid. Col.* 283, *&c.*

Though he sometimes only expresseth these Reasons, why new Obedience and good Works must be performed, *ut glorificetur Deus, & inserviatur proximo, & sint testimonia veræ fidei*; yet even these reasons do imply that new Obedience and good Works are necessary unto Salvation, *viz.* in that sense as I have explained. For can any think to be saved, except they have a care to glorifie God, to serve their Neighbour, and to give testimony of their Faith?

Ibid. Col. 279.

But

But sometimes he speaks more expresly to this purpose, saying, *Iis qui fidæ gratis acceperunt remissionem peccatorum, Apostoli etiam de novitate vitæ concionantur, & pœnas comminantur rursès sese peccatis sine pœnitentiâ pollucntibus.* *Ibid. Col. 349, &c.*

And among other places he alledgeth that *Phil. 2. Cum timore & tremore vestram ipsorum salutem operamini.*

And among other reasons, Why all must repent and walk in newness of Life, he brings in this as the sixth; *Subitus extremi judicii adventus*; And cites that 1 *Joh. 2. Manete in eo, ut cum apparuerit, fiduciam habeamus, & non pudefiamus in adventu ejus:* And that 1 *Thess. 5. Ipsi planè scitis, quòd dies ille Domini, ut fur in nocte, ita venturus sit: Cum enim dixerint, Pax & tuta omnia, tunc repentinus eis ingruet interitus, sicut dolor partus mulieri prægnanti, &c. Proinde ne dormiamus, &c.*

And for the next reason he brings in this; *Pœna æternæ impœnitentium*, citing Rom. 2. *Juxtà duritiam tuam, & cor pœnitere nescium, colligis tibi ipsi iram in die iræ, quo patefiet justum judicium Dei, &c. Ventura est indignatio, ira, afflictio, & anxietas adversus omnem animam hominis perpetrantis malum, &c.*

This (I think) is sufficient to shew that *Illyricus* (at least when he helped to write the Centuries) was as much for Obedience and good Works as either *Bucer* or *Melanchthon*, for any thing that I see you cite out of them, and that he made them so Fruits of Faith, whereby we are justified, and have right to Salvation, that withal he made them Means or Conditions of Glorification; and more than this the words of *Bucer* and *Melanchthon* do not import.

Whereas you say, that *Davenant*'s words, which I cited, have nothing that you dislike, save only that Grace is said to be infused *in ipso actu justificandi*, which yet you shew how it is not to be disliked; you consider not for what end I cited those words, *viz.* To shew that all Protestants generally acknowledg and profess, (so he, *Omnes enim agnoscimus, & clarè profitemur*) that Inherent Righteousness doth go along with Imputed Righteousness, though it be this and not that by which we are justified; and consequently, That Works are necessary

ry as Fruits of Faith, and Means of Salvation, though yet Works have no Copartnership with Faith in justifying.

Neither *Bucer* nor *Melancthon*, nor any of our famous Divines that I know, did teach other Doctrine. And because you seem to carry it so as if *Melancthon* and *Bucer* had been of your Opinion; though what I have said already may suffice to shew the contrary, yet I will add a little more.

Tom. 1. *loc. de bonis Oper.* *Melancthon* saith; *Planè & clarè dico, Obedientia nostra, hoc est, justitia bonæ conscientiæ seu operum, quæ Deus nobis percepit, necessariò sequi reconciliationem debet.*

But here he saith no more for Works than generally Protestants do; he is far from making them concurrent with Faith unto Justification.

Ibid. de Vocab. Fid. Again; *Sed nos (inquit) sciamus suum locum esse justitiæ operum, longè verò aliâ consolatione opus esse in quærendâ reconciliatione.*

Ibid. And again; *Cum dicitur, fide justificamur, non aliud dicetur, quàm quòd propter Filium Dei accipimus remissionem peccatorum, & reputamur justi. Et quia oportet apprehendi hoc beneficium dicitur fide, i. e. fiduciâ misericordiæ promissæ propter Christum. Intelligatur ergo propositio correlativè, Fide sumus justi, i. e. per misericordiam propter Filium Dei sumus justi seu accepti.*

Tom. 2. *de Eccles. p.* 133. And he alledgeth *Basil*, saying; *Sine ullâ sophisticâ detrahit justificationem bonis operibus; nec loquitur de ceremonialibus, sed de omnibus virtutibus; nec tenùm loquitur de operibus ante renovationem, sed de virtutibus in renovatis, ac jubet sentire, quòd solâ fiduciâ misericordiæ propter Christum promissæ justi sumus. —— Hæc est (inquit* Basilius*) perfecta & integra gloriatio in Deo, quando ne quidem propter justitiam suam aliquis effertur, sed agnoscit sibi deesse veram justitiam, fide autem solâ in Christum justificari, &c.*

In Præfat. Enerrat. Epistolæ ad Rom. *Bucer* also commends *Melancthon* for saying; *Sola fide justificamur, solius misericordiæ fiduciâ justi pronuntiamur.*

And presently he adds; *Nemini siquidem pio dubium esse potest, quin per solam Dei misericordiam, propter-*

que

que unius Christi meritum, ac nulla omnino nostra quamlibet sancta opera, & germanissimos Spiritus fructus, nos justificemur, hoc est, à Deo justi pronuntiemur.

1. I am sorry to see you so bent to maintain what you have once done. Is it fair to take hold on a few words of an Author, and to pass by that which immediately followeth, and shew that he meant quite contrary to what is pretended? Is not this to make your self guilty of that which you accuse others of, *viz.* to take up some scraps against the meaning of the whole Book, and even the very Page out of which you take them? 85.

2. I think nothing is more clear, than that Mr. *Ball*'s words following those which you cited, gainsay your Opinion, *viz.* of Works concurring with Faith unto Justification. For he expresly saith, That Faith alone justifieth, and that Works do but testifie and give proof, that Faith is lively.

Is not this the very thing that I so much contend for? And yet you stick not to say, That he yeeldeth Faith and Works to be the Condition of Justification, as if they were Copartners in this respect, whereas he ascribeth Justification wholly to Faith, and excludeth Works from having any concurrence with it in justifying. A little before the place by you cited, he opposeth those who make Faith and Works the Condition, without which Remission cannot be obtained, and saith it is impossible to conceive how Faith and Works should be conjoyned as Con-causes in Justification, seeing Faith attributes all to Free-Grace, and Works challenge to themselves. And a little before that again he saith, [*We read of two ways of Justification, by Faith, and by Works, but of a third manner, by Faith and Works both, as joint Causes, or Con-causes, we find nothing in Scripture*]. As he makes Faith to be more than a bare Condition, if by [Condition] be meant only *Causa sine quâ non*, so do I: yet he doth use the words [Condition] and [Instrument] promiscuously, and doth sometimes call Faith the one way, sometimes the other. He supposeth also, That if Works concur with Faith unto Justification, they are Con-causes, and not such Conditions as are only *Causæ sine quibus non*, as you seem to take it. Of the Coven. p. 70. *Ibid.* p. 69.

3. You say that you allow of the Explicatory terms, as I judg them. Why? then you allow of this, [Faith alone

alone doth justifie]; yea, [as it embraceth the promise of free forgiveness in Jesus Christ]; for so immediately Mr. *Ball* doth explain himself. And for this very reason he denies Works to justifie, because [*Works do not embrace Christ*]: Your distinction of Inchoated and Continued Justification, will here stand you in no stead. For besides that Mr. *Ball* speaks of Justification simply considered, it's certain that Works neither at first nor afterward concur with Faith in embracing the promise of free-forgiveness in Jesus Christ: and therefore if Faith justifie in this respect, (as Mr. *Ball* saith it * doth, and you seem to give your approbation of what he saith) surely both at first and afterward Faith alone doth justifie: though Works appear in their season, yet they do not concur with Faith unto Justification.

Of the Coven. p. 70.

* *And* p. 71. *he proves it, because in Scripture every where Faith in Christ, in the Lord Jesus, or the Blood of Christ, is said to justifie, not Faith in other Promises, Threatnings, or Commandments.*

4. That which you cite out of Mr. *Ball*, p. 20. doth not reach home to your purpose. To say, as he there doth, [*A disposition to good Works is necessary to Justification*], is no more than to say, A lively and working Faith, or a Faith apt and ready to Work, is necessary unto Justification. So when he saith, [*Good Works of all sorts are necessary to our continuance in the state of Justification, and so to our final absolution, if God give opportunity*]; he meaneth only this, that Works are necessary Fruits of that Faith by which we lay hold on the Righteousness of Christ, and so are justified and absolved. [*The Faith that is lively* (faith he) *to embrace Mercy, is ever conjoyned with an unfeigned purpose to walk in all well-pleasing, and the sincere performance of all holy Obedience, as opportunity is offered, doth ever attend that Faith whereby we continually* (*N. B.*) *lay hold on the Promises once embraced. Actual good Works of all sorts* (*though not perfect in degree*) *are necessary to the continuance of Actual Justification, because Faith can no longer lay claim to the Promises of Life, than it doth virtually or actually lead us forward in the way to Heaven*]. It is clear, that as well afterward as at first, he ascribes Justification only to Faith, as being only that which doth embrace the Promises, though he require a working Disposition at first, and Works themselves afterward

Of the Coven. p. 21.

ward, as opportunity serveth, to testifie and give proof that Faith is lively, * as he expresly speaketh. The words which you further add, I have cited before, and they are directly against you, shewing that as I and others take the word [Condition] Faith is the only Condition of Justification, and Works no part of it. And see what Mr. *Ball* addeth immediately after those words, [*Faith and Works are opposed in the Matter of Justification, not that they cannot stand together in the same Subject, for they be inseparably united, but because they cannot concur or meet together in one and the same Court, to the Justification or Absolution of Man*]. That which you cite from *p.* 21. is not to be understood (as you seem to take it) of actual walking, but of a disposition to walk, as he said *p.* 20. [*A disposition to Works*, &c.] This disposition is the qualification of that Faith, or always conjoined with that Faith, whereby we are partakers of Christ's Righteousness. This plainly appears to be his meaning, both by the words immediately going before, and also by the words in the preceding Page, both which are already cited.

* Of the Coven. p. 73.

1. If Personal Righteousness be not perfect, but have need of pardon for the imperfection of it, then there is no being justified by it. This very reason *Luther*, *Melancthon*, *Calvin*, and *Chemnitius* give, why we cannot be justified by Inherent Righteousness, as I noted before out of *Wotton de Recon. part* 2. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 19. *num.* 4. And to this purpose I also have cited before the words of *Calvin*, *Davenant*, *Amesius*, *Rivet* and *Maccovius*. As for the Metaphysical Perfection of Being, which you speak of, it is but such as doth belong to things that are most imperfect. And for *Præstatio Conditionis N. Legis*, it is not (as I have said before) properly that Righteousness by which we are justified, though it be required to that end, that we may be partakers of Christ's Righteousness, and so (*viz.* by that Righteousness of Christ) be justified. 2. Of Justification *quàm continuationem*, *& Sententiam Judicis* (*nempe in ultimo Judicio*) enough hath been said before. Neither *Calvin*, nor any of our famous Divines, (that I know) nor yet the Scriptures (so far as I can find) do teach, that we are justified by Faith alone at first, but by Faith and Works afterward; yea I have shewed the contrary both from the Scriptures, and from our Divines; yet they both teach, That Faith whereby we are (both at

Ibid.

first

first and afterward) justified, hath in it at first a readiness to Works, and afterward doth work, as opportunity is offered. *Quid commerita est Fides* (*inquit* Maccovius) *in progressu vitæ, ut tantum non possit, quantum in initio? Ergone ingenium fides mutaverit, &c. De Justif. Disp.* 10. See *Calvin Instit. lib.* 3. *cap.* 14. §. 11. and *Rivet* in *Gen.* 15. *Exercit.* 83. *pag.* 404. *Col.* 1. Whereas you say that *Calvin* maintaineth a true Personal Righteousness; What is that to the purpose? Who doth not so? If that were all that you bade see *Calvin* for, truly you might soon cite Authors good store: but (as *Martial* speaks) *Dic aliquid de tribus capellis.* Shew that either *Calvin*, or any Judicious Orthodox Divine doth hold such a Personal Righteousness, as whereby we are justified: both *Calvin* and all our eminent and approved VVriters (that I know) deny this Personal Righteousness to be available unto Justification. Yea, and so do some of chief account in the Church of *Rome*. *Contarinus*, a Cardinal, to this purpose you may find cited by *Amesius contra Bellar. Tom.* 4. *lib.* 5. *cap.* 1. *Thes.* 1. *Pighius* also, a great Romish Champion, is as clear and full for this as may be. *In illo* (*inquit* &c. *Christo*) *justificamur, non in nobis; non nostrâ, sed illius justitiâ, quæ nobis cum illo communicantibus imputatur. Propriæ justitiæ inopes, extranos in illo docemur justitiam quærere.* Much more he hath to the same purpose, and herein doth so fully agree with Protestants (though about Faith, as being that alone whereby the Righteousness of Christ is imputed to us, he dissents from them); that *Bellarmine* having recited the Opinion of Protestants, saith, (*De Justif. lib.* 2. *cap.* 1.) *In eandem sententiam, sive potius errorem incidit Albertus Pighius*; he adds also, *Et Authores Antididagmatis Colonienses.* And for *Pighius* he saith further, *Bucerus in libro Concordiæ in articulo de Justificatione, fatetur Pighii sententiam non dissentire à Lutheranorum sententiâ, quod attinet ad causam formalem Justificationis, sed solùm quantum ad causam apprehensivum, quam Lutherani solam fidem, Pighius dilectionem potius quam fidem esse definit.* Here by the way observe, That *Bucer* (if *Bellarmine* did truly relate his Opinion, though not his only) made Christ's Righteousness imputed to us, the formal Cause of Justification, and Faith the only apprehensive Cause: and that therefore he was far from making us to be justified by our Personal Righteousness, & from making Works concurrent with Faith unto Justification; but that otherwise is evident enough by what hath been cited before out of him. The truth of my Conclusion (I think I may well conclude) is firm and clear, *viz.* That according to *Calvin* (and so *Bucer* and all our famous Writers) Personal Righteousness is not that whereby we are justified. What colour you can have to except

except against this Conclusion, to say it is merely my own, is to me a wonder.

Ibid. Repentance and Love to Christ are not excluded from our first Justification, yet have they no co-interest with Faith in Justifying; Faith, not Repentance, or Love being *Causa apprehensiva* (as *Bucer* and other Protestants do speak) that which doth apprehend Christ's Righteousness, by which so apprehended we are justified. Neither is it denied, that outward Works are requisite, that we may continue justified here, and be sententially (solemnly and openly) justified at the last Judgment: yet it follows not that Justification as continued and consummated at Judgment, is by Works, as concurring with Faith unto Justification. It is the Righteousness of Christ apprehended by Faith, by which we are justified from first to last, only this Faith being of a working Nature, we cannot continue justified, nor shall be (*i. e.* declared to be) justified at the last Judgment, except we have Works to testifie and give proof that our Faith is lively, as Mr. *Ball* before cited doth express it: but thus also it will follow, that Works being wholly wanting, we never had a Justifying Faith, nor were at all justified.

86. 1. That the Qualification of Faith is part of the Condition of Justification, so that Faith alone, as apprehending Christ and his Righteousness, is not the Condition (or Instrumental Cause, for I do not take Condition for *Causa sine quâ non*, but for that which hath some causality in it) you have not proved. The Condition of our Justification is that we believe in the Lord Jesus Christ; this presupposeth a desire of him, and inferreth a delight in him, and submission to him; yet it is only believing in him, by which we are justified. 2. Though the taking of Christ for King be as Essential to that Faith which justifieth, as the taking of him for Priest, yet not to Faith as it justifieth. Of *Fides quæ*, and *Fides quâ justificat*, as also of taking Christ for King, and taking him for Priest, I have said enough before. 3. I mean that Faith only justifieth, as it receives Christ as Priest, tho that Faith which justifieth doth receive Christ as King also. 4. If it be (as you grant) Christ's Satisfaction, and not his Kingship (or Sovereignty) which justifieth meritoriously, then (as far as I am able to judg) it is our apprehending of Christ's Satisfaction, and not our submitting to his Sovereignty, by which we are justified. The Act of Justifying Faith, as Justifying (me-thinks) can extend no further than to that Office of Christ, in respect of which he justifieth; or than as Christ is our Righteousness, by which we are justified; Christ as Advocate doth only justifie by pleading his Satisfaction for us, and our interest in it, and as Judg, by declaring us to be justified by it: and all this *secundum fœdus novum*, which is the ground of our Justifi-

cation. 5. I so confess Faith to be the Condition of Justification, that nevertheless I hold it to justifie as apprehending Christ's Righteousness, God having in that respect required Faith of us, that we may be justified. And herein (as I have shewed before) I have Mr. *Ball* and other Judicious Divines agreeing with me, who call Faith a Condition of Justification, and yet make it to justifie as it apprehendeth Christ and his Righteousness.

Ibid. My words clearly shew my meaning, *viz.* That Justification as it is begun by Faith alone, so it is continued, so that Obedience hath no more influence into our Justification afterward than at first. Justifying Faith at first is Obediential, *i. e.* ready to bring forth the Fruit of Obedience; and afterward, as there is opportunity, it doth actually bring forth the same; yet both at first and afterward it is Faith and not Obedience by which we are justified.

Ibid. 1. I have also oft enough told you, that you bring nothing of any force to prove Sentential Justification at Judgment a distinct kind of Justification, or any more than a declaration and manifestation of our present Justification. 2. For the Texts which you alledged, you do not answer what I objected. You alledged them to prove, That we are justified compleatly and finally at the Last Judgment, by perseverance in faithful Obedience. I objected, That they speak of Justification, as it is here obtained, and so make not for your purpose; to this you say just nothing, only you seem to say something to those words in the end of the *Animadversion*, [*They shew who are justified, not by what they are justified*]; but that which you say, is of small force. For none can truly say as much of the Texts alledged for Faith's Justifying, seeing that those Texts expresly say, That we are justified by Faith, and that Faith is imputed unto us for Righteousness, which the other Texts do not say of Obedience.

Ibid. 1. Did you never understand my meaning about Faith's justifying until now? Nay, you seem not yet to understand it. Doth not Faith justifie at all, if it only justifies Instrumentally and Relatively? Is this so strange unto you, that when we are said to be justified by Faith, it is meant in respect of the Object, *viz.* Christ and his Righteousness, which is indeed that by which we are justified, though it must be apprehended by Faith, that we may be justified by it? Where is now the *totus mundus Theologorum Reformatorum*, which sometime you spake of? My acquaintance in this kind is not so great (I think) as yours, yet I have before alledged many to this purpose. I will here add one more, a Man of note, Dr. *Prideaux*, (*Lect.* 5. *de Justif.* §. 11, 14, 16.) *Justificamur* (*inquit*) *per justitiam Christi, &c. Atqui Fides ex parte nostrâ hanc justitiam sic a Deo imputatam, apprehendit solus modo & applicat; quia neque Charitati, vel Spei, vel alteri*

alteri habitui hoc munus competat. And again, *Justificat primò Deus Pater admittendo, & imputando. 2. Deus Filius, Satisfaciendo, & advocatum agendo. 3. Spiritus Sanctus revelando & obsignando. 4. Fides apprehendendo & applicando. 5. Opera, manifestando & declarando.* And again, *Animadvertere potuit Bertius, nos non propriè justificationem fidei attribuere, sed metalepticè, quatenus objecti actus propter arctam connexionem inter illum & habitum, usitatâ Scripturæ phrasi, in habitum transfertur.* 2. For Christ's Righteousness justifying formally, or being the formal cause of Justification, I have shewed in what sense some of our Divines do hold it, and some reject it, and that the difference is rather in words, than in the thing it self. 3. To me it seems no obscurity to say, [Faith or Believing doth justifie, because Christ's Righteousness, except it be apprehended by Faith, is not available to Justification]. Is not this as much as Faith doth justifie Instrumentally, or as apprehending Christs Righteousness by which we are justified? The reason why Christ's Righteousness cannot justifie, except it be apprehended by Faith, is this, That God doth require Faith of us; Faith (I say) apprehending Christ and his Righteousness, [*Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ*] that so we may be justified. God's Will is properly the Cause, yet there is a congruity in the thing it self, an aptitude (you grant) in the nature of Faith: it is of an apprehensive Nature, and its apprehending of Christ's Righteousness (the Will of God still presupposed) doth make this Righteousness ours, even as a Gift becomes ours by our receiving of it. If *Davenant*'s words, which I cited, be not against you, then nothing that I can say is against you. For I cannot express my own mind, as to that point, more clearly and fully than he doth. I will repeat his words again; (*De Justit. Habit. cap.* 28.) *Nihil usitatius quàm causæ applicanti illud tribuere, quod propriè & immediatè pertinet ad rem applicatam. Quia igitur fides apprehendit, & applicat nobis justitiam Christi, id fidei ipsi tribuitur, quod reapse Christo debetur.* Is not this against you, who say, *Append.* p. 120. [*Faith is a Work and Act of ours; and if Faith justifie as an apprehension of Christ, it justifieth as a Work?*] Do not these words of *Davenant* tell you, that it is not *Causa applicans*, but *res applicata*; not *Fides*, but *Christus fide apprehensus* that doth justifie? Faith then is said to justifie, yet not in respect of it self, but in respect of its Object: it is not properly Faith apprehending, or the apprehension of Faith, but Christ and his Righteousness apprehended, by which we are justified. Much hath been said before to this purpose. If this be nothing against you, I know not how in this particular to say any thing against you: if it be against you, surely it is nothing but what that Reverend Author saith in the words cited. And mark (I pray) upon what occasion

he brings in those words. *Bellarmine* (*De Justif. lib.2, cap.9.*) saith that *Calvin*, from *Rom.4. Ubi dicitur fidem Abrahæ imputatam esse ad justitiam*, gathers, *nihil esse aliud nostram justitiam (nempe quâ justificamur) quàm fidem in Christum, id est,* (*N.B.*) *Christi justitiam Christi fide apprehensam.* Against this he objects, *Apostolus dicit ipsam fidem imputari ad justitiam: fides autem non est justitia Christi, &c.* To this *Davenant* answers, *Sed frivola est hæc objectio. Nam nihil usitatius quàm causæ applicanti, &c.* Your Objection is the very same in effect with *Bellarmine*'s; so that if *Davenants* words be any thing against *Bellarmine*, they are as much against you. And truly as you put off the words of *Davenant*, so you might with the same ease have answered all my *Animadversions*, and so you may all these Exceptions, by saying, That they are not against you. It is a strange faculty that you seem to have, of making any thing for you, as when you bid see *Calvin* on *Luk.* 1. 6. and nothing against you, as here in this place.

Ibid. When Mr. *Manton* speaketh of Faith Justifying as a Relative Act, his words immediately before (which I also cited) shew his meaning, *viz.* That Faith justifieth in its relation to Christ, as it receiveth Christ: so that not every Act relating unto Christ, but that which doth so relate unto him as to receive him, is that which justifieth: but what I say of the Act justifying, must always be understood in the sense before explained. That Faith in respect of its apprehensive nature, is more than *Causa sine quâ non*, to me is clear; it is *Causa applicans*, as *Davenant* in the words even now cited doth call it. 2. To contend much about Faith's Instrumentality, I do not like; I mean in respect of the word [*Instrumentality*], so that we agree in the matter: yet as our best Divines have used the word, I see not but it is convenient to be used. 3. I grant that it is a material question, Whether it be the receiving of Christ only as Priest that doth justifie; for the confounding of Christ's Offices, and of the Acts of Faith (as Mr. *Blake* before cited saith well) is not to be endured. But I see no necessary dependance of this question upon the other, *viz.* Whether Faith justifie as an Instrument, a sole-working Instrument, or as an Ordinance, or Relative Action required on our parts; which Mr. *Manton* said is all to the same issue and purpose, and so I think it is.

87. For the distinction of God's Will, you might at first apprehend what I meant, though perhaps my Expressions were not altogether so clear as afterward; neither indeed do you seem to speak so clearly of it in your *Aphorisms*. 2. How pertinent those Testimonies which you speak of are, I cannot tell; but truly as you cited *Calvin* on *Luk.* 1. 6. it is no hard matter to cite many. 3. What you alledg out of *Davenant*,

nant, I might evade, by saying as you did, That it is not against me; but I will not put you off so. I answer therefore, *Ad* 1. [*Bona opera sunt necessaria omnibus fidelibus, & justificatis, qui habent usum rationis, & per ætatem operari possunt*]. *Ita sanè res habet: quis negat? Sed num ideò bonis operibus æquè ac fide justificamur? Adverte, quæso ipsa authoris tui verba.* [*Bona opera sunt necessaria justificatis*], *non justificandis. Nam* (*ut scitè* Augustinus) [*Bona opera sequuntur justificatum, non præcedunt justificandum. Quid quod tuipse fateris, nos fide absque operibus in initio justificari? Ita, inquies, sed postea ut justificati simus, opera etiam à nobis requiruntur. At* Davenantius *istud non dicit, non ita certè verbis quæ citasti. Jubes autem legere sequentia; lego igitur*, [*Facile est hujusmodi opera multa* (*præsertim interna*) *commemorare sine quibus justificatio nunquam fuit ab ullo mortalium obtenta, nunquam obtinebitur*]. *Sed ne hîc quidem dicit opera ista pariter ac fidem justificari. Ea enim, quæ ad justificationem requiruntur, cum iis quæ justificant, confundi non debent, ut benè monet* Amesius. *Quin & ipse* Davenantius *latum di crimen facit inter Fidem & Opera, cum Fidem ideò justificare dicat, quod justitiam Christi apprehendat, ac nobis applicet. Id enim Fidei peculiare est, nec Operibus ullo modo tribui potest. Ex* Davenantii *igitur sententia, non partim fide, partim operibus, sed fide solâ justificamur. Ad* 2. That Conclusion is the same in effect with the former. Some internal Works must go before Justification, yet they do not therefore justifie as well as Faith. *Davenantius eo ipso loco negat opera necessaria esse ad justificationem, ut causas, sed tantùm ut ab obtinendam Equestrem dignitatem necessarium est adire aulam regiam, atque coram rege in genua se dimittere. Fidem autem* (*loco alio, atque alibi citato*) *dicit esse causam applicantem justitiam Christi, atque ideò ei tribui, quod proximè & immediatè pertinet ad rem applicatam; Fidem nempe dici justificare, cum propriè justitia Christi fide apprehensa justificet; id quod ego mordicus teneo. Ad* 3. *De retinendo scilicet, & conservando Justificationis statu, anteà satis responsum est. Id nunc dico* Davenantium *nec in principio Justificationis, nec in progressu ejus vim virtutémque justificandi operibus juxta ac Fidei tribuere, etiamsi dicat bona opera ad Justificationis Statum retinendum & conservandum esse necessaria; id quod ego libenter agnosco. Cum enim in ipso Justificationis exordio Fidem operibus gravidam esse oporteat, procedente demum Justificatione Fidem opera parere necesse est. Ad* 4. *Dico te extra oleas vagari, cum ego de Conditione Justificationis loquar, atqui istiusmodi*

De fide & operibus, cap. 14.

Contra Bellar. *Tom.* 4. *l.*5. *c.*5. §.1.

*De Justit. Hab. cap.*24. *Arg.* 8.

ufmodi quidem Conditione, quâ justificari dicimur, tu autem opponis mihi authorem de operibus justificatorum (i.e. Eorum, qui jam justificati sunt, & fide quidem, non operibus, ex authoris istius sententiâ) ad salutem necessariis differentem. The Pages to which you further refer me, I cannot consult, my Edition differing from yours, as you might perceive by some places which I cited. But your Inference is of no force, as having no ground for it, *viz.* That if I will be of *Davenant*'s mind, I must be of yours. I do not see that *Davenant* doth attribute as much to Works as you do, who hold that they justifie, and urge the words of St. *James* for it, whereas *Davenant* (as I have shewed) makes Faith to justifie as apprehending and applying Christ's Righteousness, which surely Works cannot do. He saith also, *Opera sequuntur Justificationem, & præcedunt Glorificationem*, being not acquainted (it seems) with your distinction of Justification as Inchoated, and as Consummate at Judgment, whereby you would have Works to be as well a Condition of Justification, as of Glorification. What *Davenant* doth mean when he calleth Faith an Instrument, he doth sufficiently shew, making Faith to have a Causality in Justifying, by apprehending and applying Christ's Righteousness, by which we are justified. But do our greatest Divines give as much to Works as you do? This you will undertake (you say) to manifest. Why? then make it appear, that they hold Works to justifie as well as Faith, or to have a co-interest with Faith in the Effect of Justifying. Except you perform this, (which I presume you never will) you cannot make good your Undertaking. So do our greatest Divines give more to Faith than you. As you urge the τὸ ῥητὸν of St. *James* for being justified by Works, so you also insist upon the very Letter of St. *Paul*, and will have Faith it self to be properly our Righteousness, by which we are justified: This our greatest Divines do not no more than the other. Yet you stick not to brand them, as making Man his own Justifier and Pardoner. Πῶϊόν σε ἔπῳ φύγεν ἕρκος ὀδόντων; Truly this is overgross. What professed Adversary could reproach our greatest Divines more than thus? Whither will not a Man's partiality carry him, if he be let alone? May you not as well say, That Christ made some their own Saviours, because he said, That their Faith had saved them? I had thought that all the Glory did belong to the principal Agent, rather than to the Instrument. And to what purpose do you say, [*Who can forgive sins but God only?*] Do they that make Faith an Instrument of Justification, deny this any more than you, who make both Faith and VVorks Conditions of it?

De Justit. Act. cap. 32.

Yea,

Yea, some will have that *Monstrum horrendum*, and first-born of Abominations (as they phrase it) to be laid at your own door. For my part I shall say no more than this, That you seem as guilty this way your self, as they whom you censure, though neither you nor they (I think) are indeed guilty in this kind. Mr. *Kendal* against Mr. *Goodwin*, *cap.*4.*p.*140.

But why may not Man's Act be an Instrument of God's Act? Or to speak more properly, Man acting be an Instrument of God acting? We are workers together with God, 2 *Cor.* 6. 1. Surely not in a way of Co-ordination, but in a way of Subordination; and so Man may be God's Instrument. I am not therefore of your mind, but think, that the Gospel rather is properly a Means, and Ministers Instruments: though to be nice and curious about words, so that the Matter be sound and good, I do not love.

Ibid. & 88. 1. That Faith doth justifie, as it apprehendeth Christ, *appello totum Mundum Theologorum Reformatorum*; I have given you enough to this purpose before. Now to your Reasons why this is to set up τὸ *Credere*, I answer; *Ad* 1. Not *Apprehendere & Credere simpliciter*, but *Apprehendere & Credere in*, *i.e. Apprehendere Christum*, *& Credere in Christum*, are all one. And when it is said, That this doth justifie, the meaning is, *Christus fide apprehensus justificat*: so that this doth not set up τὸ *Credere*, as some do set it up, who make it as our Act simply considered, to be that Righteousness by which we are justified. *Ad* 2. Their meaning is not obscure, as you pretend, that you may the better oppose it. The Object of Faith, Christ's Righteousness apprehended by Faith, doth justifie: and so Faith is said to justifie, not as considered in it self, but in respect of its Object, which it apprehendeth, because it apprehendeth that, *viz.* Christ's Righteousness which doth justifie. *Ad* 3. The formal reason why Faith doth justifie, is its Apprehension, yet still that is in respect of the thing apprehended, *Causa applicanti illud tribuitur quod immediatè pertinet ad rem applicatam. Id fidei ipsi tribuitur, quod reapse Christo debetur*, as *Davenant* before cited doth express it, whose words you said were not against you, though none can be more in this Matter.

For the second Point you are quite mistaken. For I do not put a difference betwixt Justification and Right to Salvation, but betwixt Justification and Salvation it self, *i. e.* the full enjoyment of it, *viz.* Glorification. I have frequently expressed my self to this effect, That by Faith alone we are justified, and so have Right to Salvation; yet by VVorks and Obedience also we must come fully to enjoy Salvation.

In

In hoc Fœdere (scil. Evangelico, saith *Davenant, De Justit. Actual. cap.* 30. *pag. mihi* 396.) *ad obtinendam reconciliationem, justificationem, atque æternam vitam, non alia requiritur Conditio, quam veræ & vivæ fidei.* Presently after he explains himself thus; *Justificatio igitur, & jus* (*N. B.*) *ad æternam vitam ex Conditione solius Fidei suspenditur.*

By the way you may observe how he calls Faith the Condition, and the only Condition of our Justification, and yet he makes it not to be *Causa sine quâ non*, but *Causa Instrumentalis & Causa applicans*, as appears by his words before cited. Your following Arguments are not against me, you do but fight (as they say) with your own shadow. Yea, you having objected against your self, *Rom.* 5. 10. You answer directly as I use to do, *viz.* That *Paul* doth not distinguish betwixt Reconciliation and a Right to Salvation, but betwixt Reconciliation and actual (and Compleat) Salvation. You add, That *Paul* makes them both Fruits of Free Grace. And what Protestant (say I) doth not so? A necessity of good Works, as the way of attaining unto Salvation is asserted, yet it is denied that good VVorks are meritorious of Salvation. That in *Rom.* 8. 6. (whence you infer, That only Faith is not the Condition) proves not that Faith alone is not the Condition of Justification and Right to Salvation, which is all that I contend for. VVhat you mean by those words [*Life as well as Righteousness*] I do not know. Neither do I see what those Verses, 13, 14, 17. (*viz.* of *Rom.* 8.) are for your purpose. VVhereas by the way you say, [*Faith justifies, not* quâ Instrumentum, vel Apprehensio proxime, sed quâ Conditio præstita, *because Justification is given as a Reward; and Rewards are given on Moral Considerations, and not merely Physical*]; I have told you before, That I also include a Moral Consideration, and do not make Faith to justifie merely as it is of such an apprehensive Nature, but as being of such a Nature, God therefore in that respect hath been pleased to make choice of it for that end, that by it, apprehending Christ and his Righteousness (*i. e.* properly by Christ and his Righteousness apprehended by it) we should be justified.

FINIS.

THE SUBSTANCE OF Mr. Cartwright's EXCEPTIONS Considered.

BY

RICH. BAXTER.

LONDON,
Printed for *Nevil Simmons* and *Jonath. Robinson*, at the Princes-Arms and Golden-Lion, in St. *Pauls* Church-yard, 1675.

The Substance of Mr. *Cartwright's* Exceptions considered.

TO reply to these Exceptions *verbatim*, I conceive were a sinful loss of time, and a great wrong to to the Learned Author, and more to my self, and most of all to the Reader and the Truth. For it would unavoidably tire us all, and drown the Truth in a mountainous heap of useless Altercations; and the main business would be to manifest a Reverend Brother's mistakes, which I conceive may sooner kindle the fire of Anger, than the light of Information.

I shall therefore pass by all that part of the work, and only deal with the remaining Differences, which are the Soul of the Book, and that not in the Order as they lie, but as they seem of greatest moment, or are most insisted on by the Reverend Author.

The main substance of the Exceptions, consisteth of these points following:

1. That I say *Faith* (and secondarily *sincere Obedience*) are as to the Law of Works or Innocency, but the *Conditions* of our Justification by Christ's merits, from its condemning sentence: But they

are our material Righteousness in respect to the *Law of Grace*; viz. *a particular subordinate Righteousness*, because a *Condition* of our Pardon and Salvation. But Mr. *C.* yieldeth that they *are such a Condition*, but not that we are *justified by them*, or that they are our *Righteousness* thereto.

2. That I make *Works* to have a *co-interest* with *Faith* in Justification.

3. That I make *Faith* to be *but a Condition* of our main Justification, consisting in remission of sin: But Mr. *C.* makes it a *Cause*, which he calleth *Causa applicans*.

4. That I make *two Laws*, and Mr. *C.* but *one*; only yieldeth to call the *Promise* the *New-Law*.

5. That I make the New-Covenant a Law to have a *peculiar penalty*, which Mr. *C.* denieth.

6. That I make *Obedience* a Condition of our *right to Salvation*, [*Juris continuandi vel non amittendi*] though not of our first Righteousness: And Mr. *C.* makes it a Condition of *Salvation it self*, and not of *our right to it*; yet confesseth that it is the same thing that is the Condition of Justification, and of right to Salvation.

7. That Mr. *C.* makes the *Gospel-Grant* to be properly, *A Sentence of Absolution by God as Judg*; and I make it to be but *A Donation of pardon and life by God as Rector and Benefactor by Law, and Deed of Gift*, and so a *virtual*, not an *actual judicial Sentence*: Which yet I little stick on.

8. Mr. *C.* taketh the Judgment after this life to be no other or further Justification than we have here, but only a further *Declaration* of it: And I take it to be a decisive Sentence, to put our right out of controversie, giving us our *Jus Judicatum*,

as

as the *Promise* did our *Jus Constitutum*, and moreover, being the orderly means to our possession.

As to the first of these Differences, I would know, Whether it be about the *Matter* or the *Word* that we disagree? If the *Matter*, then Mr. *C.* would never have granted, 1. That Faith and Obedience is an *inherent* or *personal Righteousness*, and so called commonly by Scripture and Divines. 2. That it is the *fulfilling* of the *Conditions* of the *New-Covenant*. 3. That if we be *accused* to have *no right* in Christ, because we have *not fulfilled* this *Condition*, we must plead the *actual fulfilling of it* by our selves, or perish; and not plead any fulfilling of it *by Christ* for us, nor any *pardon* for our *not fulfilling* it. 4. Yea, that even wicked men may have a true *particular Righteousness*, (though not *this* which is the Condition of Salvation) I remember now no one *material* difference left between us.

And if it be only *Verbal*: 1. I conceive that the Dispute, [*Whether the fulfilling of the Conditions of the New-Covenant may be called Righteousness, or we be said to be justified by it?*] when we are agreed in the *thing*, is not worth the contending about. 2. Mr. *C.* saith, *p.* 91. of his Exceptions, *Non oportet litigare de verbis cum de re constet.* 3. He confesseth (as is said) that even a wicked Reprobate may have a *particular Righteousness*, and owneth *Bradshaw*'s so denominating it. He therefore that will yield that the *Devil* or a *Reprobate* may be called *righteous quoad causam particularem*, and that that is *Righteousness*, methinks should not deny it in our case. 4. He confesseth (for it is undeniable) that all our Divines do give the *name* of

Righteousness to our *inherent Righteousness*: Therefore *de nomine* we differ not. 5. He denieth not (for it is past denying) that *Scripture* often calleth our *Faith* and *sincere Obedience* by the name of *Righteousness*: So that when I so call it, I do but speak as the Holy Ghost hath taught me. Thus far then methinks, we should be fully agreed (as in sense so) that the *name* of *Righteousness* is lawful and fit to be applied to our Faith it self, and personal Obedience.

It remains then *de nomine*, whether we may say, 1. Either that this *Faith* or *Righteousness* doth *justifie us?* 2. Or that we *are justified by it?*

For the *former phrase*, I use not to say [*Faith justifieth:*] 1. Because it soundeth as if I made it an *efficient Cause*. 2. Because Scripture rather useth the *other* phrase. [*We are justified by Faith.*] Though there seem small difference in these speeches, yet indeed the latter best fitteth the nature of a *conditional* or *dispositive Interest*: And the Holy Ghost is the fittest Judg. But for the latter phrase, and the former taken in the same sense as the latter, *viz.* [*That Faith justifieth as a Condition*, and thence consequentially, as the *matter* of our *subservient particular Righteousness*,] I should think that here is no room for a disagreement. For,

1. None can deny but that I speak in the Language of the Holy Ghost, who saith, [*A man is justified by Works, and not by Faith only*;] and that [*by our words we shall be justified, and by our words we shall be condemned.*] Say not I mistake the *meaning* of these words; while, 1. Our Question is not now about the *meaning* or *matter*, but about the *fitness* of the *phrase*. 2. And the thing that I am

first

first blamed for, is not the misunderstanding of a particular Text, but of the *Doctrine* of Justification.

2. It is beyond all doubt a contradiction unworthy the Pen of any Learned man to say, *This is our Righteousness, and yet will not* in tantum *justifie us*; (and *in totum*, I ever denied it as much as they:) *Forma proculdubio informat & denominat.*

3. *To justifie*, (in the sense I use it) is (first) *to constitute Righteous*, (for I take it for *constitutive Justification* first:) But it may be said, that we are *constituted Righteous* by *Faith* and *Obedience* (not speaking of *universal Righteousness*:) Therefore it may be said we are *justified by them.*

Nothing can be said to this Argument, but against the *minor*, by denying that the word [*Justifie*] is ever taken for *constituting Righteous*, but only for *sentencing* us so: But I never yet met but with one Learned man, that I remember, that was of that mind. Our Divines ordinarily distinguish of *Justification constitutive and sentential*: 1. His Reason is, because it is still taken *in sensu forensi*, and so we maintain against the Papists. But I answer, Our Divines take not *sensum forensem*, as excluding, but including, *sensum Legalem, vel Civilem* (as we commonly speak) but only as excluding *sensum Ethicum*, as it signifieth merely our acts and qualities of *Ethical Justice* or *Virtue*. Now so I grant against the Papists, that Justification signifieth not most usually nor very oft an infusion of new Qualities; but 1. *Non reatum culpæ vel pœnæ*, which is Innocence and *Legal Righteousness*. 2. *Sentential Absolution.* Now I say no more, but, 1. That our *Non-reatus culpæ finalis impœnitentiæ & infidelitatis*

aut Rebellionis, is our *particular Righteousness or Justification.* 2. Our *Non-reatus pœnæ propter hanc culpam* is founded herein as the *matter.* 3. Our *Non-reatus pœnæ æternæ* in general dependeth on this (at the last Judgment) as on a *Condition.* 2. I little doubt but Scripture (mentioning Justification by Faith) means it of *constitutive Justification*; and Mr. *C.* for ought I perceive, thinks so too, taking it and sentential Justification for all one.

If then we may be said to be [*made Righteous*] by *Faith* and *Obedience*, then we may be said to be *justified* by them: But the former is true; Therefore, *&c.*

That Righteousness which makes not righteous, is a thing never yet known, except it were only *nomen justitiæ sine re*, and it were only equivocally so called. For *Righteousness* is a mere *relative form*, and therefore must make, that is, formally *constitute* the *person righteous so far.* Even as there is no existent *Worthiness*, that makes not *worthy*; or *Guiltiness*, that makes not *guilty*, or *Unrighteousness*, that makes not so far *unrighteous*; or *Goodness*, that makes not so far *good:* I think none will contradict this.

4. I'll tell you what I will do? If godly Divines would not have me use *James*'s phrase, and say, [*We are justified by Works,*] yea, or by *Obedience*, yea, or *by Faith*, as *Paul* speaks, rather than wrong the Churches peace, I will utterly lay it by in speech and writing; and I will only say, [*We are made righteous,*] and not, [*We are justified*] by them. And so in my Explication of our Righteousness, I will say, that we have a twofold Righteousness: 1. *Inherent personal Righteousness* (*Evangelically* so called)

called;) which by reason of its exceeding Imperfection (for so I am content to speak) will not justifie us of it self in Judgment: This consisteth *inchoatively*, or at first, of *Faith and Repentance* without external Obedience; afterward, of *Faith continued*, and *Obedience added*. 2. The other *Righteousness* is *meritoriously Christ's Satisfaction for our sin*, and *formally the pardon of sin it self*, whereby the defaults of all our Faith, Obedience, and other Graces, together with all the sins of our lives, are remitted, or our *jus ad impunitatem & regnum*. Our Faith or Obedience is none, no not the least part of this Righteousness of Remission, and right to Life: But yet Christ in granting his Act of Pardon or Grace, did *except final Infidelity and Impenitency* out of it: And therefore as he *pardoneth* none such, so his *Righteousness* of *Remission* alway supposeth concurrent our *personal Righteousness* (quâ talis, *not to be remitted*;) Christ never died to purchase us pardon for loving God, hating Sin, Repenting, Obedience, *&c.* but only for *the sin* that adheres to these in their deficiency or evil company. Why may not this much reconcile us?

Nay, Note these two things:

1. That Mr. *C.* in his pleading for an imperfect Righteousness, so denominated from its Conformity to the Law, *page* 68, 69. professeth, that [*Accepting for Righteous, and accounting just, is as much as justifying*;] and that, [*it is the New-Covenant that so accepteth our Works, as they are a sincere, though imperfect, Conformity to the Law as a Rule*;] and that; [*for his part he should say, that we and our actions are justified from the Law of Works*, i. e. *from the Condemnation of it.*] Now is not here

here as much, or more by far, than I say for Works?

1. More: For I do not think that God's acceptance of our Works, is a *justifying* them from the *Law's Condemnation*; but that they are *unjustifiable*, and still *condemned* by the Law; and that the Gospel was never of force to save *mens Works* from the *Law's Condemnation*, but only to save the *person*: Nay, that if the *Works* be not *condemned* by the *Law*, the *person* cannot be *justified* by Christ, but must be justified by his *Works*: For *justified Works* will *justifie* the *person*, so far as they are *justified*; and if the *Works* be *not condemned*, the *person* cannot be *condemned* for them.

2. But I intend not this as an Accusation of his Opinion; for I believe he meaneth soundly: But then at least consider, Whether this be not as much as I say? He alloweth here, and professeth to use the term [*Justification of our Works*] as the *subject*: And if it be fit to say, *God justifieth* our *Works*, then what man can devise a Reason why it is not as fit to say, *God justifieth us thereby?* so far *in tanto*, though not *in toto*: For as *Bradshaw* truly saith, *Every Justification of the cause, is indeed a Justification of the person.* I take it for granted therefore, that Mr. *C.* alloweth me to say, that we are justified by *our Works and Faith* as our *particular Righteousness*, by a particular Justification: Yea, he in other places plainly expresseth as much. Now he must needs know, that I often told him, I take it but for a *particular Righteousness*, and to be but *Materia Justificationis particularis, & conditio Justificationis plenariæ, vel (suppositâ conditione præstitâ) universalis.*

2. Note

2. Note alſo, That he gives it as the very ſum of all his Anſwer on this point, that [*our Faith (and Obedience)* as an *imperfect Conformity* to the *Law*, is a *particular Righteouſneſs*, and ſo it juſtifieth not; but as it is the *Condition* of the *Covenant*, it juſtifieth, and ſo it is no *Righteouſneſs*.] Now it is here granted, that a *perſonal Righteouſneſs* is requiſite to our *Juſtification*, though not as *Righteouſneſs*. If Faith, which is our Righteouſneſs, be neceſſary, though not *as* our Righteouſneſs, but as a *Condition*; for my part I have all that I deſire for ſubſtance in his Conceſſion, that *Faith juſtifieth as a Condition*. The reſt is but of the *name*: And of the name himſelf ſaith, *p.* 40. [*The Queſtion is not, Whether we be ſaid to be juſtified by our Works or Words* (that he confeſſeth) *but how and in what ſenſe we are to be ſo juſtified: There is a particular Juſtification, and a declarative Juſtification: Thus we are juſtified by our Works and Words; but a full and formal Juſtification is only by Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, through Faith imputed to us.*

But what Reaſon gives he through the whole, why Faith is no *Righteouſneſs* as a *Condition?* He ſaith ſtill, that [*It is no new Accuſation to be accuſed of not-performing the Conditions of the New Covenant, but a making good the former.*] But it is moſt evidently a diſtinct ſubordinate *Accuſation* towards the making good the firſt. Is the *means* and *end* all one? Is it all one to accuſe a Traytor of being liable to death for *Treaſon* merely as ſuch; and to accuſe him of not performing the Conditions in an Act of *General Pardon?* and ſo having no benefit by that Act for his eſcape? The *words* are not the ſame, nor the ſenſe the ſame, therefore the Accuſation

sation is not the same. Those things which are divisible are not the same: But these are divisible; *ergo*, &c. The Devils may be accused of being guilty of death for sin as sin; but not of *non*-performance of Conditions of Recovery: For a mere Negation is no ground of Guilt or Accusation.

But he thinks, that [*the Law constituteth the* officium Credendi, *and the Covenant the Condition; therefore as a Condition performed, it is no Righteousness; and as a Duty performed, no justifying Righteousness, but particular.*] I answer, 1. If this were all so, yet when the Covenant doth take *one Legal duty* for its *Condition*, our Salvation may lie on that *particular Righteousness*. 2. Will it, or may it ever be questioned in Judgment, or not, *Whether we have performed the Condition of the New-Covenant?* I think it will be the *main* Question: I am sure in *Conscience* it is the main. If it may ever be questioned, *Whether we have right in the Promise and Christ's blood or no*, I know no way of Legal evincing it, but by producing the *Deed of Gift*, or our *performance* of the *Condition*. All the doubt then to be discussed will be of the latter; and on this will Reprobates begin to plead, [*Lord we have done thus and thus*;] for the *Gift* will be undeniable. Now if this will be a *Cause* to be pleaded at Judgment (yea, for ought I can understand by God's Word, the great Cause of the day,) then certainly the Defendant will be *Guilty*, or *Not-Guilty*; and his Cause will be *just*, or *unjust*. If he have *justitiam Causæ*, then Mr. *C.* is mistaken; if he have not, the man is condemned. Mr. *C.* is very much out to imagine (and make it the substance of most of his Answers in the main Question) that our performance

performance of *a Condition as such*, may not be a *Righteousness*. What if it were granted to be no *Ethical Righteousness* (and yet I am loth *Covenant-breakers* should have so much countenance, or that *God's Covenant-keeping* should be denied the name of *Righteousness*;) doth it follow that it is not a *judiciary Righteousness*, a *justitia forensis* which is *nearest* to our great Justification?) If Contractors enter a Suit one against another for not-*keeping Covenants*, may not, must not the Accused or Defendants Cause be *just*, or *unjust*? If a man enter an Action against another for not-performing a *Promise*, for not-doing what by *Lease* or other *Covenant* he was bound to; I think the Law will pronounce him and his Cause *just*, or *unjust*; and acquit and justifie him, or else condemn him accordingly. If it be capable of being a *Cause in Law*, or the matter of an *Action* or Suit, then it is most necessary a righteous or unrighteous Cause. But,

3. I do not think it tolerable so to exclude the *Law as a Law* from this work. For,

1. The *very Covenant* is a Law, even the *promisory part*: I prove it, 1. God is so super-eminently and transcendently above us, and our absolute Sovereign, that we are not capable of entring into a strict Covenant (as among equals) but such as participateth of the nature of a Law. We have so wholly our dependance on him, and good from him, that he can make no *Law* of *favour*, or for our *good*, but so far it must be as a *Benefactor* (it being otherwise with earthly Sovereigns, whose Subjects receive not all their propriety from them:) And also he is so conjunctly our *absolute Sovereign*, that he can enter no *Contract* with us but *authoritatively*.

2. From

2. From the Definition: A Law taken most fitly, though largely (for *jus Constituens*, adequate to *jus Constitutum*; and not for *Lex*, as its narrowly taken as distinct from *Precept*, *Priviledges*, *Contracts*, &c.) this true proper *Law* is but *Constitutio debiti Authoritativa*; or, *Signum voluntatis Rectoris debitum Constituens*. Now *Constituere debitum præmii*, is as true an Act of *this Law* (though *every Law* have it not, which made some exclude it;) as *constituere debitum officii*. Yea, acts of absolute *free Grace* or *Pardon* are *true Laws*. So that God did make the *New-Covenant* as *Benefactor* and *Legislator* both; and so gave the Legal *jus ad Beneficium*, and constituted the *Condition* of his own Gift.

2. Besides, I am not yet of Mr. *C*'s mind, that the *Precept* it self, which he calls the Law, is not a real part of the *Covenant*. What though it be part of the *Law?* so it may be, and of the *Covenant too*; for the *Covenant* (as Mr. *Lawson* hath well shewed) is truly a *Law*, called a *Covenant* from the more excellent part (the *Promise*) and from God's Condescention, and from man's requisite Consent: Yet called a *Law*, as being the *authoritative Constitution* of what shall be *due to us* (good or evil) and what shall be *due from us* for the obtaining of one, and escaping the other. But of this more anon about the Law.

3. Nay, as Unrighteousness condemneth not directly, as it is contrary to *Duty*, but as it is contrary to the *Condition of Life*, and is the Condition of the Threat: So when it concerneth Judgment, the word *Righteousness* doth most nearly belong to Duty as a Condition, and remotely to Duty as Duty performed.

2. The

2. The second Question or Point of Difference, [*I make Works to have a co-interest with Faith in Justification.*]

But how? It is sure confessed not in our *first Justification*, and that it is principally in our last great Justification at Judgment. Do I advance Works higher than others? or do I not rather seem to depress Faith lower? I never made Works to be the the *instrumental Cause* of Justification, as others do *Faith*. I never made them the *causa applicans*, as Mr. *C.* makes Faith. I never made them *any proper cause*. I do aver in the end of my Answer to him, that I give *less to Faith*, but *no more* to *Works* than others.

His Answer is this: [*Why? then make it appear that they hold Works to justifie as well as Faith, or to have a co-interest with Faith in the effect of justifying: Except you perform this (which I presume you never will) you cannot make good your undertaking.*] *Ans.* I have proved over and over, that they affirm *Repentance* a *Condition* of Pardon; and *Obedience* a *Condition* of final *Justification*. If I prove that they do thus, and that I do no more, do I not prove that I give no more to Works than they? What, must I prove that they give *no more* to Faith, and *so* make *no greater inequality* than I, before I can prove that they give *as much to Works*? The co-interest of a Condition I can prove by forty of them, that they give as far I: But must I prove that they give *Obedience* the co-interest of *a cause*, which I deny my self?

So

So I did in the next lines cite *Davenant*, saying the very same words as I, and as fully as I desire, and largely explaining and proving them. Yet *Davenant* said well, and I say ill, when I am ready to subscribe to his words in the sense as they must plainly import, or with a Protestation to understand them as rightly as I can: If this be not *non ex fide personas, sed ex personis fidem*, &c. as *Tertul.* what is?

And what is the Difference? Why it is said, [*Dico te extra oleas vagari, cum ego de conditione Justificationis loquor, atq; ejusmodi quidem conditione quâ Justificari dicimur: tu autem opponis mihi authorem de operibus Justificatorum, i. e. eorum qui jam Justificati sunt, & fide quidem, non operibus, ex authoris istius sententia, ad salutem necessariis differentem.*]

Resp. 1. *Putàssem propiùs ad rem controversam pertinere, quid ego loquor, & de quali conditione, quam tum, cum ego rei & tu actoris partes agis?*

2. *Nonne* Davenantius *etiam loquitur de conditione? & de conditione sine qua non? & de conditione ad Justificationis statum retinendum & conservandum? imo de conditione concurrente vel præcursoriâ? Ipsissima authoris verba sunt.*

3. *Nonne & ego de Justificatorum operibus semper sum locutus, quando dixi ea ad Justificationem continuandam esse necessaria.*

It is further answered by Mr. *C.* to the fifth Conclusion, [*Some internal Works must go before Justification, yet they do not therefore justifie as well as Faith.* Davenantius *eo ipso loco negat opera necessaria esse ad Justificationem ut causas, sed tantum ut ad obtinendam equestrem dignitatem*, &c. *Fidem autem*

(*alio*

(alio loco) dicit esse causam applicantem justitiam Christi, atq; ideo ei tribuit quod proximè & immediatè pertinet ad rem applicatam, &c.]

Reply. 1. Doth not he say, that they are necessary [*ut conditiones præcursoriæ?*] If they are *Conditiones*, they have the *interest* of *Conditions* in Justification. I say not, [*They justifie us,*] because that phrase sounds as if I ascribed an *efficiency* to them; but only, that [*we are justified by them as Conditions.*] And to say, [It is a Condition of Justification, and yet we may not be justified by it as by a Condition] is no better than to say, [Such a thing is an efficient, but causeth not as an efficient.] I deny them to be *Causes* as well as he.

2. And what if you proved that he makes Faith *a Cause*, when I do not, and so doth not so nearly equal them as I? Doth that prove that I give *more to Works* than he? or rather that I give *less to Faith?* He that will affirm, that he ascribeth no more to Works than you, is but sorrily confuted by your saying, that he ascribeth *less to Faith*, that is, that he gives Works a *co-interest* with Faith: Which he may do, by derogating from *Faith* (or from your estimation of it) without adding any further dignity or power to Works.

Mr. *C.* gives this as his summary Answer, [*Your first inference is of no force, as having no ground*, viz. *that if I will be of* Davenant's *mind, I must be of yours. I do not see that* Davenant *doth attribute as much to Works as you do.* (2.) *Who hold, that they justifie; and urge,* (3.) *the words of St.* James *for it; whereas* Davenant (4.) *makes Faith to justifie;* (5.) *as apprehending and applying Christ's Righteousness, which surely Works cannot.* He saith also;

(6.) *Opera sequuntur Justificationem & præcedunt Glorificationem*; *being not acquainted it seems with your distinction of Justification, as Inchoate, and as Consummate at Judgment, whereby you would have Works to be as well a Condition of Justification as of Glorification.*

Rep. If ever words were spoke against most *express evidence in terminis*, I think these are; 1. That my words were groundless, when I have no fitter expressions of my own mind, than in *Davenant*'s words. 2. I hold not, [*that they justifie,*] but that [*we are justified by them,*] which phrase better fits a mere Condition than the former. 3. I take the words of *James* to be Scripture; and doth it prove, that I give more to *Works* than *Davenant*, because I cite the express words of Scripture? What if I misunderstand that Scripture? doth it follow that I give more to Works? 4. Is this an Argument to ground your Accusation on [Davenant *makes Faith to justifie, as apprehending and applying Christ's Righteousness: Works cannot so do*?] What then? *therefore* Davenant *gives less to Works than you?* A sorry consequence! Or is it, [*Therefore* Davenant *makes not Works to justifie.*] *Answ.* Nor I, if you take it efficiently, as you say, *Davenant* doth make *Faith a Cause.* But, 1. Is not this his giving *more to Faith*, and not *less than I to Works?* 2. Doth he not say, that Works are Conditions of Justification, some *precursory* and *concomitant*, and some for *continuing it?* And I still profess, that we are justified by them but as *Conditions.* If you say, I call them *Righteousness* by which we are justified, I have answered that before; that is *lis de nomine*, and I so call them but *à posteriore*, because they are *Conditions*

ditions of our *Justification*, and you and *Davenant* call them *a particular Righteousness* as well as I. I still say, as to our *universal Justification*, they have no further interest than the very *essence* of a *Condition imports*; and if *Davenant* give them not this, he was to blame to tell us otherwise. 5. I make Faith also to justifie [*as Apprehending and Applying*,] if you do not take the word [*As*] strictly *pro ratione formali*, but as signifying Faith's *special aptitude* to a preheminence in this Work: And I affirm, that *Works* do *not justifie* as *Apprehending* or *Applying*: (still remember, that when I use the phrase [*Faith justifieth*,] I use it in Conformity to your Discourse, and mean it as is before explained. 6. Do not I say, as well as he, that *opera sequuntur Justificationem & præcedunt Glorificationem*? and doth it thence follow, that he was unacquainted with my distinction of Justification *Inchoate and Consummate* at *Judgment*? Why? 1. You know the same man was acquainted with the distinction between *Justification Inchoate and continued*. 2. And that that he saith *Works follow Justification*, makes them *precursory Conditions* of *Justification*, and *Conditions* of its *Continuance*? and so plainly acquaints you, that it is those *external Works*, which he makes *Conditions* of *continuing Justification*, which he saith, *follow* it; which no doubt but they do. 3. Think you then, that this Learned man did not know, that Christ would come again to judg the quick and the dead? and so could distinguish between Justification *here* and *hereafter*? Or did he ever dream, that the Saints should be *judged*, and yet not *justified then*? why, then they must be *condemned*? For *Judging* is the *Genus*, and hath but those two *species*.

But I have spoke further to this than I intended.

The sum of my Reply to this Question is this: 1. *I never gave Works a co-interest with Faith, in causing or effecting our Justification*: For I never gave *Faith* such an *interest*. 2. I never gave *Works* an *equal interest* with Faith. 3. I never gave *external Works any interest* in our *first Justification*. Only to that I require, that the Faith be such as Mr. *C.* himself so much pleads for, *A working Faith*, or *non renuens operari*; or that hath Works in it *Virtually*, (as taking Christ for King to be obeyed.)

Contr. 3. The next Difference between us is this: *Mr.* C. *makes Faith to be* Causa applicans *of our Justification; and I make it to be but a Condition.*

I understand my own term partly, but I understand not his: What Cause is this *Causa applicans*? As far as I understand him, he meaneth an *efficient Cause*: And that which is an *efficient*, may be said to *effect*. Here is the difference then, I do not make Faith to *effect* the *pardon of any sin*, that is, *to pardon me* (as a less principal Cause:) But had Mr. *C.* given us this *Causality of Faith* in any notion familiar to us Logicians of the lower Form, we should better have known what to make of it. In the mean time should I presume but to pass my Conjecture which of the sorts of *Efficients* he intends, perhaps I might wrong him by my mistakes; yet let these two things be remembred: 1. That I hereby give *less to Faith*, but not *more to Works*. 2. That I only *excuse myself*, for not calling Faith,

A Cause of Justification: But I do not *accuse others* that so call it, nor will I contend with them about it, if they mean a moral Cause, or *per accidens only*, if they will give me leave to forbear. And though anon I shall shew, that I hope you may yet mean the same as I by *Causa applicans*, that it is but *dispositio causæ materialis, id est, Recipientis*; yet because so great a number of great Divines call it the *instrumental Cause*, I must first speak to that sense, on that supposition.

And here I remember Mr. *C*'s next words to those even now cited: [*Do our Divines give more to Faith than you?* 1. *As you urge the* τὸ ἐντὸν *of St.* James, *for being justified by Works; so you also insist upon the very letter of St.* Paul, *and will have Faith it self to be properly our Righteousness by which we are justified: This our greatest Divines do not, no more than the other.*]

Reply. 1. I had rather be accused of adhering too close to the words of the Holy Ghost, than of departing causelesly from them.

2. How oft have I told you over and over, that I make Faith to be no further our Righteousness, than as it is the *Condition* of our *Righteousness merited by Christ?* And knowing this, could you think and say, that I give more to Faith than your self, who say, it is the *Condition* as well as I? Sure the *naming* of this *Condition* by the *name Righteousness*, is not giving *more* to it! If it be, 1. You cannot say so, that use the name your self; 2. And here seem to confess I have [*the very letter*] of *Scripture* for it: And that's enough I think to justifie the *name*, while I agree with you in the *thing*.

He proceeds thus: [*Yet you stick not to brand them as making man his own Justifier or Pardoner,* Ποῖόν σε ἔπος φύγεν ἕρκος ὀδόντων. *Truly this is over-gross: What professed Adversary could reproach our greatest Divines more than thus? Whither will not a man's partiality carry him, if he be let alone? May you not as well say, that Christ made some their own Saviours, because he said, that their Faith had saved them? I had thought that all the glory did belong to the principal Agent, rather than to the Instrument.*]

Reply. Where I have offended God in wronging men, I desire and hope for pardon. Yet if I may give a true account of my words, I must say, 1. That I would have you review, whether it be you or I that broke the Ninth Commandment. I did not say, that these Divines do make man his own Justifier; but only that [*I give not to Faith, and so to man so much as they, not daring to make man his own Justifier.*] I am afraid *I should be guilty* of this, if I said, that Faith effecteth our Justification: Doth it follow that I say, *They are guilty of it?* I think not, for all your anger. For Consequences are not to be fastened upon men that disown them, at least, as *directly* guilty of them: *I see them,* or seem to my self so to do; it would therefore bring that guilt *on me,* if I held their opinion, though it may not on them (unless remotely.)

2. I never once thought of charging the men as holding, that they justifie themselves; but only I charged *their opinion* with it consequentially. And must the Reverence of men prohibite us to mention or intimate the ill Consequences of their mistakes? Then hath the Serpent got the day, when he

he hath once lodged his errours in Reverend breasts: It will be no more lawful to disturb him, if he be once so housed. Who is he that liveth, and erreth not? What errour in Morality hath not absurd and vile Consequents? If we *mention* them, it seems we are *given up* to a lamentable state of sin.

3. I now understand why you heap up the words of some *late Reverend Divines*, which I thought did make up *utramq; paginam* in your Exceptions; and though themselves might receive a fair Answer, yet did seem your most irrefragable Argument. But if this be so, it's vain to dispute any more: For if I bring Scripture or Reason, you may say, The Divines are against it. If I argue against their Opinions, by shewing their absurdities, you may say, What *professed Adversary* could *reproach them more?* It's *too gross* to charge Absurdities or ill Consequents on a Doctrine that such men hold. Then must mistakes dare us and deride us, when they are got into these holts, we can follow them no further.

4. What say you by *Amesius*, that saith, That there is such a Concatenation of Truths, that whoever denies one, and holdeth one errour, doth by Consequence overthrow the Foundation? *Cas. Conf.* I am not of his mind, unless it be limited to some kind of Truths: But it seems then he thought, that consequentially *every errour* denied Christ the Foundation: How far was this man given up to reproach, not only the late Reverend Divines, but all men living? far more than I.

5. M. *C.* thinks that Christ's *active Righteousness* in obeying the *Moral Law*, is not *imputed* to us for our *Righteousness*. I suppose his Reason is much drawn from several Absurdities or ill Consequents

which he thinks will follow, if the contrary be asserted: Perhaps, that it will make Christ's death needless or vain; (for those that say as he, do charge it with no less.) Must I therefore lament the condition of Mr. *C.* as one left of God, to reproach all those Churches and Divines that are against him, as bad as their professed Adversaries do? and say, He makes them deny the death of Christ?

6. If I must believe as the Church believes, which Church is it? why am I not as excusable for being loth to reproach the Church of Christ for 1200, if not 1400 years after Christ (who never made Faith *the Instrument* of *justifying*, that I could yet find) as accusable for reproaching some part of the Divines of *Europe* for 150 years, by declaring the Reason of my dissent from the ill Consequence of their Opinions? If we must go to the *Poll*, neither you nor I shall be well pleased; if to the *Ballance*, to weigh the Authority of Divines, where dwells he that must hold the scales?

7. Either we may charge *Consequences* on the owners of mistakes, or not: If not, then how come I to be charged with this hainous crime; which can be no way made good, but by pretending such Consequence? If we may, then *I might do it*; which yet I did not on the *men*, but their *Opinion*.

8. If this Consequence follow not their Doctrine, then disprove it. My proof is this: [He that saith, The act of my Believing is the efficient Cause of my Justification, doth consequently say, that I justifie my self: But, *&c.* therefore.] The *major* is plain, in that, [If the act be an *Instrument*, it is the *Agents Instrument*: But I am the Agent; therefore.] And if

if I do by this *Instrument* produce the effect, then I do pardon my self, for that's the effect.

9. You say, [*Whither will a man's partiality carry him, if he be let alone?*] 1. That *Partiality* was the cause either you *do know* or you *do not*. If you *do not*, according to my simple Opinion, you should not have so sentenced: If you *do know it*, then either *directly* by seeing my *heart* from *York* hither; (which I will not suppose you to pretend to:) Or else by some certain *sign*. Suppose you have signs of my reproaching our Divines, yet prove by your signs that I did it through *partiality:* I say again, *prove it*. 2. If it were from partiality, then it is by siding with some *other party* against you, whom I prefer before you: That party is either my self alone, or *some others*. If others, who be they? Papists or Protestants? or who? I know no party on Earth that I prefer before them, or equal with them (which I speak on supposition that I know my own heart as well as you do.) If it be my self, then the Charge is much higher: But the prover must be χαρδιαγνώστης. To value my own judgment before so many, and such men, and thence so to reproach them, I confess is a hainous crime: where I know nothing by my self, yet am I not thereby justified. But surely, if I do know my own heart, I am partial in all my studies, for those men whom I am charged to be partial against, even against my self, and all others now living: But the light of appearing-Truth is that which forceth me to differ from them; and if I am mistaken, I have not yet learned a remedy. But certain I am, that partly *partiality for these* Reverend men, and partly the lothness to incur their censures, and especially

ly lothness to occasion their offence and disquiet, have been so strong a temptation to me to shut my eyes, that I have been sometimes provoked to say, [*Depart from me; this knowledg is an ungrateful burthen, an offence to my dearest Friends, and makes men take me as a man of Contention:*] sed vicit veritas, (if I mistake not.)

I think he that considers, 1. That you have *that party* on your side who are a stronger temptation to partiality than any party (besides Christ, his Truth, and the same men in other things,) that I have to sway me against them. 2. And that you so much *use their words*, where I conceive better Arguments are wanting, may perhaps see cause to put it again to the enquiry, Who is more likely in this Cause to be partial?

1. As for your inference from Christ's words, [*Thy Faith hath saved thee.*] I reply, 1. Christ did not say, that I can find, [*Thy Faith is the efficient instrumental cause of thy Salvation,*] nor I think any thing equipollent: For I suppose he intended no more than the interest of a *Moral Condition*; if you take it to be spoken of saving him from his *disease*, or from the *guilt* of sin. But if you can prove, that it was spoken of saving him from the *power* of sin by further Sanctification, then I will yield, that their Faith was some cause. 2. So far as a man is the efficient of his own Salvation, I think he may properly be called his own *Saver:* Men are called in Scripture the Saviours of others; why not as truly of themselves, when they are said to save themselves? If it be unfit (as it is) to use the word *Saviour* in this sense, of a mere man, the Reason is not from any Logical unfitness (unless that so full a name should

not

not be unlimitedly given to him, that is the cause of one part of Salvation, and not the rest;) but it is, because it will be justly offensive, now Christ hath made this his proper name. But can you prove, that man doth as truly *pardon himself*, as he doth *reform himself* further by Faith? and so that Logically there is no more against calling him his *own Pardoner* or *Justifier*, than [*the saver of himself from actual sin.*]

11. You say, you [*had thought all the glory had belonged to the Agent, and not to the Instrument.*]

Reply. 1. We were not speaking of the *glory*, which is a *Moral Interest* (where spoke I a word of that?) but of the *Natural Efficiency*. 2. I never was of your mind, nor ever shall be I think. I know as the creature compared to God is *nothing*, so its honour compared to his is *nothing*; and I know its honour, as well as its essence and existence, is all derived from God. But I think God puts an honour upon every Instrument that he useth, and most in their best and noblest Works. Proved, 1. The *Relation to God*, the *principal Agent*, puts an honour on it, to be *Instrumentum Dei*. 2. The Relation to the *end* or *happy effect*, puts an honour on on it. 3. Every Instrument hath an *Aptitude* to its office, and that *Aptitude* is honourable. 4. All *free Agents* have a *Moral honour* in being instrumental to any good, in that they act it *voluntarily*. 5. God will *commend* the *Moral actions* of his people, that were but mere *Conditions* of the effect; therefore surely those that were *Instruments:* And Gods *commendation* doth both suppose them *honourable*, and *put a glory* or *honour* upon them.

3. But if it must be as you say you thought it to be,

yet I pray you remember to do me this right, as when-ever I give *more to Obedience*, or *less to Faith* than you would have me, do not charge me with derogating from the *honour of Faith*, seeing *no glory* is due to it as an *Instrument!* And if I do give less to Christ than you, tell me of it, and spare not.

He next asks, [*Whether they that make Faith an Instrument, do deny any more than I (who make both Faith and Works Conditions) that none but God can forgive sins?*]

Reply. I think they do deny it more than I. I confess they do not make man the *principal Cause*; but in making him the *Instrumental*, they make him as an *Instrument under God* to *pardon himself*, I think. The effect may be ascribed to every Cause, according to the nature and proportion of its Causality: But *Conditions* are *no Causes* as such.

2. You make both *Faith and Works Conditions* of *Salvation*; *i. e.* Glorification: And is not that as much against the honour of Christ, as making them the Conditions of Justification in Judgment? If it were true, that one were dishonourable to him, it would be as true of the other; but is indeed true of neither.

Here I remember the like great offence that you took before at these few words [James *took not* Calvin's *counsel*;] when you had said, Calvin's *counsel was not to use the phrase, of being justified by Works.* And you say, that [*it contains nothing but a taunt against* Calvin, *and that it's unworthy usage of so Reverend a man.*]

Reply. Truly, I do reverence scarce any name, since the Apostles days, or at least since *Austin*, more than *Calvin*'s: And there was not in me, that

I know of a taunting intent; nor do I see any thing in those words that contain such unworthy usage as you express. The words signifie but this, [James *his practice was contrary to the counsel that* Calvin *there gives, not to use the terms, of being justified by Works*:] I thought the Emperor or the Pope would have endured as hard language as this. Certain I am, the greatest persons in honour Ecclesiastical or Civil that ever I knew, would not have taken it for such unworthy usage (as far as I can be certain by their making lighter of far worse.) Truly I fear, that this extream high expectation of such superlative Honour in the Ministers, is the great thing that threatens our calamity: When the example of the fall of the Roman Clergy by *Luther*, hath no more humbled us.

After this again, you bid me, [*put not off* Calvin *with a taunt, as I did before.*] But I have said more to these by-pages than I thought to have done.

The sum of all is this, I understand not what Cause it is that you call *Causa applicans*, till you tell me. But I verily think that you are of my mind, and do not know it, and that you mean with Dr. *Twisse causam dispositivam* (for so he oft saith, Faith is of Justification;) which is but *Dispositio Recipientis*, and is part of the subjective material Cause, and no efficient at all; some call it a passive (receiving) Instrument: And indeed *conditio præstita* is *dispositio moralis recipientis* In the mean time, I pray you take it rather for a *depressing Faith* (which yet you say the glory belongs not to as *Instrument*) than for an *advancing Works*, if I say that *Faith* is *no efficient Cause* of Justification.

Contr.

Controv. 4. [*Mr. C. acknowledgeth but one Law, from which the Covenant is distinct; and I make two distinct Laws.*

To this I have spoken at large to others, and therefore shall say little now; the rather, because I take what is said to Mr. *C.* to remain satisfactory for all his Answers. Only I shall briefly explain my meaning about this.

Prop. 1. A *Law* is *Debiti (vel juris) constitutio Authoritativa, vel signum voluntatis Rectoris debitum constituens.* This Definition is not of *Lex*, as distinct from *Precept*, *Priviledg*, *Contract*, in the narrow sense; but as it is the *Constitution* of all *Moral right* or *due*, and so the *act* is adequate to the *product debitum.* This is called *Jus*; which word signifieth both *Jus Constituens*, and *Jus Constitutum.* The first is, *Law* in the *true general nature* of it; the second is *Debitum.* Even *Contracts* do oblige by an exercise of that *Imperium* which a man hath over his *own actions* and himself: Or else they are not efficiently obligatory at all, but only the *Antecedent Conditions*; which when man hath put, *God seconds* them with an Obligation.

Prop. 2. The parts of a Law are two: 1. One is the *Constitution of what shall be due from us.* This is called *Precept*, *de agendo vel non agendo* (which is *Prohibition:*) This constituteth the *debitum officii.* 2. The second is the *Constitution* of *what shall be due to us.* This is twofold: 1. Of *Good.* 2. Of *Evil.* 1. Of *Good:* And that is twofold, 1. *Absolutely given,*

given, without any *Condition*; which is commonly called the act of *God quà Benefactor*, but so is all *giving* whatsoever; yet is it his act as *Legislator* too. 2. *Conditionally*: Which hath two acts, 1. To *constitute* the *Jus ad Datum*, or the *Debitum beneficii*. 2. To constitute the *Condition* of that *Jus* or *Debitum*. And that is, 1. The *Condition* of our *first right*. 2. Or of our *continued right*. 3. The Constitution *de Debito mali pœnæ*, is *ever conditional*, i.e. *propter culpam*: And though the word *Condition* is commonly used *in bonam partem*, as a member of *Promises* and *Contracts*, yet is it truly and properly also used *in malam partem*, as a member of the Threatning.

Prop. 3. All the Doctrines, Narratives, Historical and Prophetical found in Scripture, are *Adjuncts* of God's Law in the strictest sense; and *parts* of it in a *larger sense*; yea, they are *signa Constituentia Debitum*, and so true parts of Law strictly taken in their *Remote* use, though in their *neerest* use they are but *Adjuncts*; even as Narratives of the matter and occasion, are in many Statute-Laws of this Land.

Prop. 4. All the *generical essence* of a Law, is found in each *individual*; and there needeth no *other form*, but mere *matter* for the reception of that *general nature*, to make an individual Law.

Prop. 5. The Specification of Laws therefore, is not so proper as the Specification of Substantial Beings, but a Moral, less proper Specification.

Prop.

Prop. 6. Laws may be said specifically to differ, and be distinguished these ways: 1. From the *special end*; especially when the ends are much distant or destructive of each other. 2. From the very *matter*, when the difference is very great, and so from the *Condition* of *Premiant* or *Penal* acts. 3. From *Divers Efficients*, i. e. *Legislators*, or the divers grounds of Legislative right, and so of Legislation. 4. From the *signifying matter*; and so some are written, some verbal, *&c.* 5. From the state of the *subject* to whom the Laws are given. 6. From the number of parts: So some are only Precepts, some are only for reward upon duty, some only for division of Inheritance, or Constitution of particular Rights without Conditions. Some have all the forementioned parts, Preceptive, Penal and Premiant: For they are not essential parts of a *Law in Genere*, but only of *some Laws in specie*, from the *order* of *effecting*. Some are made immediately by the Sovereign Power; some the Sovereign makes mediately, by giving power to others to make them; as Under-Laws of Corporations, *&c.* so from the manner of the Sanction, as remediable, or remediless, Reward and Penalty.

Pro. 7. The word [*Law*] agreeth properly to all the parts of God's Law, taken singly; not only to the Precept and Commination, but also the *Promise*: Yea, it is as properly called a Law as a *Covenant*; because a Law doth but *Jus Constituere & Obligare subditum*; but a Covenant is a *self-obliging*, and a making a duty to our selves, and so putting a Law upon our selves. Now in the most strict sense, God can-

cannot be said to be *obliged*, (as *Durandus* and others shew:) But in that the perfect Goodness, Veracity, Fidelity and Immutability of God doth ascertain to us the thing promised; therefore, after the manner of men, we may say, that God by his Word doth *oblige himself*, who yet strictly cannot be a Debtor: And thus God is said to *Covenant*.

Prop. 8. This same act of *Promise* is called a *Law* and a *Covenant* in several respects. It's called a *Law*, in that it is the *act of a Rector*, performed to the *ends of Government*, imposing on us the act of consenting, and annexing a reward and penalty.

Thus it is *Lex stricta dicta*. It is called a Covenant, partly as God doth, as it were, engage himself: (And so the mere Promise is a *simple* Covenant) partly as he requireth *man's Promise or Consent* to the terms (and so it is a *propounded* or *tendered* Covenant-mutual;) and partly as man doth *actually re-promise* and engage himself to God, and accept the terms of God's Covenant: (And so it is an actual, mutual Covenant or Contract.) But it is called *Jus Constituens*, a Law in the general sense, as it is the *Constitution* of *Right* howsoever.

Prop. 9. Though the true nature of a Law be found in each of the formentioned acts singly, yet it is the *preceptive* Act that is most *eminently* so called, especially as (disjunctively) taking in the *Penal Act* with it, explicitely or implicitely. And so the great and eminent work of Laws is *obligare aut ad Obedientiam aut ad pœnam*, and the *premiant* Act is not of such constant use and necessity.

Prop. 10. The word [Law] therefore is more comprehenſive than the word [*Covenant*] ſtrictly taken; the former, being properly uſed as of every ſingle act fore-mentioned; the latter only of the *Promiſe*. Yet is the whole Law ſometimes called a *Covenant* from the *Promiſe*, which is a noble part of it; but that is an improper Appellation, as calling the whole by the name of a part: But the other is more proper, as calling the whole and each part by the name of that general Eſſence which doth inform each part, and the whole. Properly therefore God's Covenants are his Laws (unleſs when the name *Covenant* is improperly uſed of mere Predictions, and then Remotely and Reductively they are *Laws*) but all *God's Law* is not a Covenant.

Prop. 11. According to the forementioned ways of Specification, God's Laws may be thus ſpecified and diſtributed: 1. As from the *ſpecial ends*. And ſo God's Laws are either, 1. For the obliging the Subject to *perfect obedience*; or for the *recovering and reſtoring* him from his revolt, and from his miſery. The former is alſo, 1. As obliging to obedience *every way perfect*: This was the Law given to *Adam in Innocency, and it doth not ſo oblige us now*: ☞ For it cannot *obligare ad præteritum*, and to *duty*, ſo far as Penalty is ſuffered for former *non*-performance. 2. Or as obliging to *perfect obedience only for the future*, as ſuppoſing former ſin: ☞ And ſo it is the *general Law of God*, and that *Law of Nature* which ſtill remains in force to ſain Mankind, obliging him ſtill to obey or ſuffer.

2. The

2. The *recovering Law* is specified both, 1. As it *restoreth* rebelling Apostatizing man *to God and his obedience*, 1. *Inchoatively*, *by Repentance and Faith*. 2. *Progressively*, by *sincere Obedience*, through Sanctification. 3. *Perfectly*, *in Glory*. And 2. As it restoreth undone, lost, *condemned man* from his *misery*, 1. *Relatively*, by *Gift*. 2. *Really*, as in the three fore-mentioned degrees. For that which brings us to God, (to Obedience, as the means to please him as the end) doth thereby restore us from our *own Misery*.

3. God's Laws are specified from their *matter*, thus:

1. As to the *Precept*: God hath a Law (or had) whose matter was *perfect Obedience* (as before-described:) And he hath a Law, whose matter is *Repentance* for *Imperfection*, *Faith* in him that *restoreth* us from sin, and *sincere Obedience* for the *future* to God-Redeemer.

2. As from the matter of the *Promisory* part: So God had a Law made to *Adam*, which (as Divines do think, and it is very probable) did promise *Adam* not only Immunity from God's Wrath, Death, *&c.* but also a *Celestial Glory* afterward, in case of his perfect Obedience. God hath now a Law, by which he promiseth to *give Christ himself* to be our *Head*, *Husband*, *and Lord*, *and Saviour*, and with him *Remission*, *Adoption*, *Justification*, the *Spirit* of the Redeemer, and a *Glorification* with our Head, where we shall for ever praise him that hath redeemed us to God by his Blood, and made us Kings and Priests to God; and in order thereto, that he will by degrees take off our sin by Sanctification, and our penal misery by Preservations,

Deliverances, Consolations, and at last by the Resurrection and final Absolution. These things were not the matter of the first Promise.

3. As to the *Threatning*, (though some say that the *New-Law* hath *no threatning*: yet) 1. God's Law *purely Moral*, 1. Did threaten to man in Innocency, *Death* in *general*, which contained the loss of God's Favour and Spirit, and of his present felicity, and his hopes of what was promised for the future; together with the pains and dissolution of his body, and everlasting pains (at least) to his Soul: Which pain would much consist in the gripes of Conscience for his not-continuing his Innocency, and in the sense of his misery in the foresaid Loss. 2. The same Law of *Nature*, called *Moral*, as still *continued to faln man*, doth *threaten* upon every further Transgression, the *increase* of our foresaid misery (so far as we are capable subjects;) and doth by *more renewed Obligations*, bind on us the same.

2. God hath besides this, his special Law of Grace, which *threateneth more* than the Law did to *Adam*, or as merely natural it doth to any: (I mean as it is made to man as man, and for obedience as such, and not as it is made to man as *redeemed* for *Recovery and Restoration*:) that is, This *New-Law* threatneth the *loss* and *privation* of all *that good*, which we before mentioned, as the *matter* of its promise; as the loss of *Christ himself*, that he shall be no Head, Husband, or effectual Saviour to us; nor be our Advocate with God to justifie us, nor intercede for our Salvation: We shall lose all the *hopes* we had of God's favour, as to be restored by him, and of the Remission of our sins, and of Justification and Adoption, and of the sanctifying Spirit

pirit, and all the Consolations of God, the joy and peace in believing, the deliverance from the Captivity of Satan, and from the dominion of sin, the right by promise to the blessings of this Life, and to eternal Glory, as purchased and restored, and of final Absolution in Judgment. The pain of *sense* also is much more than the *first* Law did threaten: For as in *general* it will be a *far sorer punishment*, so *specially* it will be inflicted for *ingratitude* against the *Redeemer*; and it will much consist, 1. In the sense of the greatness of the fore-mentioned loss. 2. In the gripes of Conscience for their ingratitude, and wilful neglecting and rejecting of so great and free a Salvation.

And whereas some say, *It is no Privation, and consequently no punishment, to lose that which they never had.*

I answer, It is very false: If they had but an *offer* of it and *conditional Promise* (specially so free and sure a one) and were put into a *possibility* of it, and a way to attain it, so that their own refusal only depriveth them of it (or their Impenitency and Ingratitude) this is properly a Privation and a Penalty: Though it's true, according to their Doctrine that deny Christ's general Satisfaction, and that he purchased to all men a possibility of recovery, it would be no punishment to miss of it, as being but a *Negation*, and no *Privation*.

4. Also and most principally from the *matter* of the several *Conditions* of the penal and premiant Acts, are God's Laws specified and distinguished. The *Condition* of the first Threatning, was the *least particular* sin; the Condition of the Threatning of the New-Law, is only *final Impenitency, Infidelity*,

fidelity and *Rebellion* against the Lord that bought us, in respect to the penalty of everlasting wrath and death: But lesser sins are oft punished with some withdrawings of the Spirit of Grace, and some sense of God's displeasure, and temporal afflictions. The Condition of the Promise of the first Law was perfect obedience, without the least sin: This is now ceased (though Mr. *G.* deny it); for, 1. The matter of the Condition now would be *naturaliter impossibile*: man having once sinned, it is *impossible* he should be perfect, and that which is done, should again be undone. It is therefore an intolerable conceit for us to conceive, that God offers life to sinners, on condition that they be not sinners; and that he hath a Covenant in this form, [*If thou have not sinned in* Adam, *thou shalt live.*] God's Promises run not upon terms of natural impossibility: For such a Promise is indeed a *Threatening* or *Sentence*, and no Promise, and is equivalent in Law-sense to this; [*Because thou hast sinned in* Adam, *thou art guilty of Death.*] 2. The Conditions of the Promises are *future* or *present* usually, and not somewhat past; at least, where *Duty* is the matter of the Condition, as here it is. And when the time of the Condition is expired (as it is when it is become naturally impossible) the Promise ceaseth. 3. God is, as it were, obliged by his Promise, while it is in force: But when the Condition is absolutely violated, God can no longer stand obliged. Our Covenant-breaking disobligeth him. 4. *Cessante naturali subjecti capacitate cessat promissio*: But the *capacity* of *all* Mankind is ceased of receiving the benefit of the first Covenant on its terms; therefore, *&c.*

Mr.

Mr. *C.* saith, *This would as well prove, that the Precept ceaseth, because man is uncapable of obeying it.*

I answer, 1. A man loseth *Benefits* by his *own fault*, but no man must be freed from *Duty* or *Penalty* by his *own fault*. *Nemo ex proprio crimine commodum recipit*, we may lose our *own right* by our sin, but God loseth not his. 2. The Law *doth cease* to oblige us to *Obedience absolutely perfect*: It doth not command us now that we shall *not be guilty of* Adam's *sin*. 3. But for the *time to come*, Obedience is not *naturaliter impossibile*, but only *moraliter per accidens ex prava dispositione*, which *aggravates* sin, but excuseth not from duty: But our capacity of the *Reward*, on the terms of that Covenant, is as *naturally impossible*, as it is for contradictory Propositions to be both true, [*Peccavimus in* Adamo,] and, [*Non peccavimus in* Adamo.]

Mr. *C.* objecteth, That *it may seem unreasonable that the Promise ceast, and the Threat be in force.*

I answer, The contrary is true: Nothing more *reasonable*, than that man's sin should forfeit his *own right*, and disoblige God, without forfeiting *God's right*, and disobliging themselves. So much of the Condition of the Promise of the first Law.

Now I add for Comparison: The Condition of the Covenant, or Promise of the Law of Grace, is *Faith*, *Repentance*, *and new Obedience*, which much differs from the *former Condition*. Of this more fully anon. So much of the Specification of God's Laws by the Conditions, the Promise and Threat; and so of the Specification of them from the matter of each part.

3. God's Laws are specified from the *divers Relations* of the Legislator, and the divers rights of Government: And so God's first Law of Nature was made by him as *Creator*, or as *Rector ex jure Creationis:* But his Law of Grace is made by him as *Redeemer*, or as *Rector ex jure Redemptionis.* Here I might easily shew a multitude of mischievous errours that follow the denying universal Redemption *quoad pretium & satisfactionem:* But I pass them. Especially note here these three things following: 1. That the *jus Redemptionis* doth not destroy the the former *jus Creationis*; but supposing it is superadded to it, and somewhat subordinate. 2. That therefore the Law of God, as *Creator* is not destroyed or abrogated by the Law of the *Redeemer*, but is superadded, and that in a certain Subordination to it. 3. That yet the said Law of *Creation* stands not now alone (as God's right of Creation to the Government stands not alone, but conjunct with his right of Redemption:) And therefore, 1. The *Threatening* is not now *remediless* as then it was, but conjunct with, and potentially or virtually destroyed by the remedying Law. 2. And therefore the *Precept* is not now to the same *ends only*, or *wholly* as before the fall: The *immediate end* indeed is the *same*, that is, that man be obliged to Duty to his Creator; but remotely there is this change, the end is not now to retain perfect man in his perfection, nor to keep him from falling from his first felicity, or forfeiting his right to the benefit of that Covenant: And the immediate remaining end, remaineth not alone: For the Law of Nature is not now only to oblige us to obey the Creator, but also the Redeemer: And it is also to

be

be the Rule of our sincere Obedience, which is the Condition of our Salvation: So that now the Law of Nature (or the Moral Law) is the Law of God as Creator and Redeemer both: For all things are delivered into the hands of Christ, and therefore the Laws. As if the Subjects and Laws of a Nation of pardoned Rebels, should by the King be delivered to his Son as their Governor, having procured their pardon: So that there are no Laws in the World now but the Redeemers Laws. But yet we must still observe a wide difference between his Law of Grace, which is proper to *God-Redeemer* as Redeemer; and this remnant of the Law of Nature, *which the Redeemer found the sinner under when he redeemed him*, and which was with the sinner delivered up to him, partly still to oblige the sinner to duty, partly to oblige him to punishment, that so he might be a fit subject for the Law of Redemption, whose very nature is to be a *remedying Law*, to dissolve the obligation of the former.

4. God's Laws also are specified, or at least diversified by the different *matter* of the *sign*. And so some Laws of God consist in his Revelations by the mere *Works of Nature, within us, and without us*, in which we may read much of God's mind; the invisible things of God being seen in the things that are made, so far as to leave men without excuse. This is now commonly called the *Law of Nature*: Other Laws God hath revealed by Works indeed, but it is *supernatural Works*: And so Christ's Life, Miracles, Death, Resurrection, giving the Spirit, were a real Law to the World that could know them: For they were signs of God's Will *de Debito Credendi*, &c. Other Laws God hath revealed by

by word of mouth, others by Inspiration, others by Writing; which are now his principal standing Laws, adjoyning to that of Nature (and containing its matter.)

5. God's Laws are divers, according to the divers states of the subject. And so God's first Law was to *innocent Man* in his *Friendship*, and in some felicity. God's *remedying* Law of Grace (yea, and his remnant of the pure Morals) is made to *man faln*: But with this difference; The *Morals as such*, remain to oblige man *qui peccator*, not only *quà peccator*. But the Law of *Grace* is to oblige, and to recover a sinner *quà peccator Redemptus & Restaurandus est*. And as Laws of men are distinguished, some being for defending the *just*, some for punishing the *unjust*; some for *loyal* Subjects, some for those that have been disloyal, *&c.* so may we say of God's Laws. But the differing ends here included are more considerable.

6. So from the *number* of *Parts*, or the several *Rights* constituted, are God's Laws distinguished. Some constitute only the *dueness* of *Duty* or *Penalty*: (as the remnant of the Law of *Nature*, or pure Morals, which lost the adjoyned Promise, and so stood alone to *Adam* before the Promise was made: I say *alone*, though not without mercy and possibility of remedy, yet without any *Promise* of a remedy revealed.) Other Laws of God have Precept, Promise and Threatning, as is aforesaid.

7. Some Laws are of God's own *immediate* enacting, though he may use a Scribe to cause the *sign*, or a Herald to *promulgate* them, yet no ones *Will* enterposeth to give them a *Being*: Such are the Laws of *Nature and Scripture*. Other Laws of God are so

so his, as that *immediately* they are the *Laws of men:* Such are all Laws of Common-wealths and Churches, which are not against God's special Laws, but according to their general Determinations and Directions: Which are all only as Under-Laws, to be made and altered *pro re nata*; which it was not fit should be determined a-like to all Ages and Nations by one universal, standing Law; nor yet did God think fit to be called down to every alteration, so as to be the visible Governour of each Church and Commonwealth: And therefore he hath entrusted a certain Legislative power for such under-Laws in the hand of his Officers; and what they do, according to his Commission, he owneth and maketh it his own Laws; and so commandeth us in the Fifth Commandment to obey them.

8. Lastly, God's Laws are much differenced from the *manner* of the *Sanction.* And so the *Threatning* of his *first Law*, though it *shewed no remedy*, yet it *excluded not all possibility* of remedy nor was a *peremptory undissolvable* Obligation: Much less is the *remaining* part of it so now, when the Covenant of Grace is made. But the *Threatning* of the *Law of Grace*, to the *final non-performers* of the *Conditions* of that Covenant, is a *peremptory Threatning*, and its Obligation is *remediless and undissolvable.* This is because God hath adjoyned to it a *Prediction*, that there shall be no more Sacrifice for sin, nor remedy, nor escape. Thus much of the several Specifications or Distributions of God's Laws.

Here note these two things:

1. That I have not instanced all this while, in the Law of the Jews Church or Common-wealth as such,

such, because the Explication of it hath such difficulties, that cannot thus *obiter* and cursorily be opened.

2. From what is said it may appear, that the first and most eminent distribution of God's Laws, as standing at the greatest difference, is between that made to *Adam in Innocency*, and that made by the *Redeemer for our Recovery*. For in almost all the forementioned respects are they differenced, as I have shewed already. And the second most eminent distribution of God's universal Laws, is into the remnant of the *Law of Nature*, Creation, or pure Morals, as now put into the hand of the Redeemer; and the proper *Law of the Redeemer* being *Lex remedians*, a Law of Grace.

Note also, That because the *Covenant* or *Promisory* part is the *principal* part of *this Law*, it being purposely a *remedying Law*, an Act of Oblivion, therefore it is more commonly called the *Covenant* than the *Law*, and more commonly and properly called the *Promise* than the *Covenant*; and frequently also (or sometime) a *Testament* (though some deny it;) and oft a *Constitution*, *Disposition*, *Ordination*, which is a *Law*, and oft and properly also called a *Law*. But the Law of *Works* with *Adam*, was principally contained in the *Precept* and *Comination*; insomuch, as it seemeth a very hard Controversie with some, Whether there were *any Covenant* or Promise at all or no. There is none found written, unless implied in the Threat; and that is hard to be concluded, seing every threat of death implieth not a promise of everlasting life: And whether it were contained in *nature or no*, is hard to say.

Paræus

Paræus in Proem. ad Comment. in Rom. denieth that there is *any Covenant of Nature*, but only of *Grace*; and faith, *God cannot naturally* be obliged to the Creature. Others think, that though in point of *Commutative Justice* he could not, yet as *Rector ob fines Regiminis secundum Justitiam distributivam*, he was *quasi obligatus*, to reward man perfectly obeying, though *how far* they dare not say. These things are left very dark, or at least, we see little of them. But (though it be probable by some passages in the Gospel, and somewhat in Reason, that *Adam* had a *Promise* not only of continuing in that felicity, but of a *greater*; yet) I never read, to my remembrance, the name of *Covenant* or *Promise* used of that Law to *Adam*.

The third most observable distribution of God's Laws, is between the Law given by *Moses* to the *Church and Common-wealth* of the Jews, and the *Promise* or *Law of Grace* by *Jesus Christ*. The differences I will not now adventure on; only I shall say these three things: 1. That one was but particular to one people, the other universal: 2. That among the Jews, this was by an excellency called *the Law*, so that they in a manner appropriated that term to it, as if they knew no other Law. 3. That therefore in *Paul*'s Epistles it is this *Judicial Law* that is commonly called [*The Law*,] and which he disputeth against directly and expressly in the Doctrine of Justification, and whose Abrogation he so contends for, and which he sets against the Law of Faith, and the Grace and Truth that came by Jesus Christ. If this be not observed, the Scripture, especially *Paul*'s Epistles, will not be understood.

The

The fourth most observable difference between God's Laws, is between the *Law of Grace*, or the *Promise* as *before Christ*, and the same as *after Christ*. This difference, though very great, yet is *mostly* but accidental in the Promulgation. At first it was revealed more obscurely, and after more clearly: At first eminently to *one Nation*, and after *universally* to the Catholick Church (and for the gathering of it first:) So that the term [*Gospel*] is appropriate to that Publication, which was *after Christ*; and the *former* called only the *Promise*. Yet *some* difference *more* than *accidental* here is between these two: For, 1. They *before Christ*, were bound to believe only *in a Messiah* in general; we are bound to believe that *Jesus Christ is he*, or we shall die in our sins: They were to believe in him as *to come*; we, *as come already*: A more general dark Belief would save them; it was not so necessary to Salvation to know his *Death*, and *Resurrection*, and *Ascension*, and *coming again to Judgment*; (for sure the Disciples were in a state of Salvation, when they knew not these:) But now all these are necessary to Salvation to be known. 2. The *matter* of their *Obedience* to the Redeemer, was not then the same as now: Then they must shew sincere Obedience partly in observing the *Jewish Law*; but now not so: Nay, we have Sacraments newly instituted, and Churches otherwise ordered, *&c.* 3. More of the Spirit and Grace was poured out after Christ than before; insomuch, as that eminent degree hath the name of [*the Spirit*] oft appropriated to it: And so it is said, the Disciples had not yet received the Spirit, because Christ was not yet glorified: And it is called the Spirit of Promise, that is the promised Spirit.

Spirit. So much for the Distribution of God's Laws.

Prop. 12. The nature or use of a *Law*, is to be the rule of our actions, and of God's Judgment: *Regula actionum Moralium, & norma judicii*, because it constituteth what is due both *from us*, and *to us*.

Prop. 13. Whatever Law therefore is in force for us to *live by*, we must necessarily be *judged* by it: And whatever Law we are *judged* by, we must either be *justified* or *condemned* by: For *judging* is the *genus*, which existeth not but in these *species* of *Absolution* and *Condemnation*.

Prop. 14. To *justifie* or *condemn* a man according to the Law, as the rule of Judgment is to *judg* that the *reward* is *due*, or *not due*; or the *punishment due*, or *not due* to him, according to the tenor of that Law; that is, that he is *guilty*, or *not guilty*, when he is charged with a fault, and to have no right to the reward, or to be liable to the penalty, because of his fault.

Prop. 15. To be *guiltless*, is to be *just in sensu forensi* against *these Accusations*: To be one, 1. That is faultless; 2. Or to whom the benefit or *reward* is due, or to whom the penalty is *not due* according to that Law, this is to be *just*.

Prop. 16. He that is *thus just*, is *therefore justified*, *because* he is *just*: For the *justitia Causæ, & ita personæ quoad hanc causam*, is it which is to be enquired

enquired after as the busines of the day: And it is the Office of the *just Judg*, to *justifie* the *just qua talis*, *because* they *are just*; and *condemn* the *unjust*, *because* they are *unjust*. For to *justifie*, is but to *sentence* him *just*; that is, *just*, *because he is just*. It is therefore impossible for any man to have *justitiam causæ*, a *just Cause*, or Righteousnes of his Cause at God's Bar, and yet not to be *justified by it*.

Prop. 17. Yet that which is the *cause* of Justification in *sensu forensi*, is not always a *proper cause in a Physical sense*; but sometime only an Antecedent, or *Dispositio materiæ*, or *Causa sine qua non*: The Cause that is to be tried.

Prop. 18. Though *mediately* (*quod ad reatum culpæ*) it be the Precept that will be the rule to judg men just or unjust by, yet ultimately it is the *penal* or *premiant* act of the Law, the *Promise* or the *Threatning*, which is it that concludeth men *just* or *unjust*, and is the immediate rule of justifying or condemning them, and not the Precept or Prohibition. These do but determine *de Debito Officii*, or what was or shall be *due from us to God*; but the final busines of the Judgment, is to determine what is *due from God* to us: And this is constituted in the Promise and the Threatning only.

Prop. 19. It is therefore the *Condition* of that *Promise* or *Threatning*, that will be the very thing by which we must be tried: (For the *Condition* is *part* of the *Promise* which is *conditional*.) And the Question of the day will be, *Whether we did perform that Condition of the Promise or not?* and so, Whether

Whether the *Condition* of the Threatning be found upon us or not.

Prop. 20. That which is our performance of the Condition of the Promise, and not committing the Condition of the Threat, is therefore our *Material Righteousness*, by which we are justified in that Judgment against the Accusation of non-performance.

Prop. 21. As there was a *Two-fold Law entire*, consisting of Precepts, Threatning, and Promise, (or at least the two first, by the consent of all, were in the First Law) made upon a double ground of Legislation, to a different End, a different Subject, *&c.* so is there a *Two-fold Judgment*, and so a *Two-fold Justification* and *Condemnation:* One by God as *Rector*, according to the pure *Law of Works*, as *Creator:* The other by God in *Christ* as *Redeemer* and *Rector* of the *Redeemed World*, upon the terms, and by the Law of Grace. The Judgment of God-Creator, according to the Law of Works, hath two parts and seasons, according as that Law doth much differ as it stood entirely in Innocency, and without Remedy, till the promise of Grace; and as it stands in part, and with that Redeeming Promise since.

1. The first Judgment that God held, was after the Fall of *Adam*, when as *Creator* according to that first Law, he sat upon the Offendors, and *passed the Sentence of Condemnation on all Mankind*: but before the *Execution*, yea even *in the Judgment*, the *Mediator* as it were *interposing*; that is, God in mercy resolving upon, and promising a way for

the rescuing of the Offendor by the Satisfaction of his Justice; he look'd upon that Satisfaction and Sacrifice as *in esse morali*; and upon consideration of it as future, he past a Sentence of *Conditional Absolution* and *Pardon*, in a *Promise* of the Messias to bruise the Serpent. But this was but somewhat obscurely done: Hereupon he prescribed typifying Bloody Sacrifices as the Conditions in part, and as further teaching intimations of the promised Sacrifice. He accepted the Bloody Sacrifice of *Abel* sincerely offered in Faith; and he rejected the Unbloody Sacrifice of *Cain* offered without Faith and sincerity; and told him, [*If thou do well*, (that is, according to the *New-Law* also) *shalt thou not be accepted?* (*viz.* through the promised Seed and Sacrifice); *but if thou do ill, sin lieth at the door*]: expounding the Covenant of Grace more fully, as being *Conditional*, and *Faith* and *sincere Obedience* being the *Conditions*: which it is most likely God fullier expounded then to the Patriarks, than is left written. This Covenant God yet made plainer to *Noah*, and yet much plainer to *Abraham*, and to the *Israelites* in Types; and yet much plainer by the Prophets, especially *David* and *Isaiah*. Thus God did first, by his own actual Sentence or Promise, and then by the same revealed fullier by Prophets and Laws, *conditionally justifie* the fallen World, and *absolve* them from their guilt.

But because the Sacrifice offered, and Satisfaction performed, was more than the same as merely promised and undertaken; therefore God reserved the fuller Declaration of that *Absolution*, which is the Fruit of it, till the Messiah should come. And then God did again more fully pronounce the Sentence

of

of *Conditional Absolution*, twice, or two ways: First, He did by a Voice from Heaven pronounce, [*This is my Beloved Son, in whom I am well-pleased, hear ye him*]; *q. d.* [According to his undertaking he is Incarnate, and is now satisfying my Justice, and doth all that I require at his hands for Man's Redemption. This is he in whom my Wrath is appeased to the World, (not absolutely to acquit them, but) so far that if they will *Hear him*, they shall live]. Next this, The Lord Jesus himself having taken fuller possession of his Dominion and Empire, doth most clearly publish the New-Law of Grace: That, [*Whoever doth Repent and Believe, shall be pardoned and saved*, &c.] This Law is an *Act of Pardon*: And being so oft spoken by God himself, and now by Christ in the flesh, it is equivalent to a General *Sentence of Judgment*. Not as Absolutely and Actually pardoning *particular* Sinners: for so it is but a Law of Grace, or a Promise of it on Condition: But as it is the solemn Pronunciation of a General and *Conditional Absolution* to all Mankind, so it is a kind of Sentence, or equivalent thereto. And thus God the Father as *Rector*, according to the Law of Works, hath himself, by an Act of Grace, *Justified Conditionally* the *fore-condemned World*. And this *Conditional Justification* is not to be sleighted, because but *Conditional*, and because that many afterwards perish: For it is a *pure free Gift*; and the Condition is but the *accepting* of *the Gift according to its Nature*, *viz. Christ* and *Life*: And *Acceptance* is so *naturally supposed necessary* in all *Gifts*, that it is not used to be *expressed* as a *Civil Condition*, but *implyed* among rational Men; and the Gift called *Absolute*, (though

indeed so far Conditional); And Refusal and Ingratitude useth to deprive Men of those Gifts which the Laws of Men call *Absolute*.

Besides, it belongeth not to *God as Legislator*, to give Men *Hearts* to *accept his Gift* (but in another Relation): And he *gives* Christ, and Pardon, and Right to Life, as *Legislator* and *Rector secundum Leges*, and as *Benefactor* together. And therefore God doth *quantum in se* as *Legislator, justifie all Men*.

In the first Justification of the *Father*, or *God-Creator*, (I mean by him *as Judg*), the *sole Condition*, and so the *sole Righteousness* of the *Justified World*, is the *Sacrifice* and *Merit* of the *Lord Jesus Christ*, who is therefore called the *Lord our Righteousness*. No Act or Habit of Man's, either *Faith* or *Works*, is any *Condition* of this *first Justification*. Thus was *God in Christ reconciling the World unto himself, not imputing to them their transgressions*. Thus have *we Redemption in his Blood, even the Remission of sins*: Thus *having purged* (or *made purgation* of) *our sins by himself, he ascended and sat at the Right Hand of God*, Heb. 1. 3. Here *Christ* the *Redeemer* was not the *Judg*, but was *judged*, and *loco delinquentis & rei: God the Father* here was *Judg*, who *first condemned* his Son, as it were; and after *Satisfaction* given, *justified first him* as *Sponsor*, and then the *World* for his sake. Thus God *forgave those all the Debt*, who yet perish by taking their fellow-Servant by the *Throat*. Remember that we disclaim all Man's *Works* or *Faith*, as not being the least part of, or Ingredient in, *This General Conditional Justification of fallen Mankind, by an Act of Pardon equivalent to a Sentence*.

But

But seeing it was never in the thoughts of the Father or Mediator to make us *Gods*, and exempt us from his Government; therefore *a Lord* we must still have, and therefore *a Law:* and he was pleased by *a Law* to *make* the *foresaid Justification*, and *convey* to us our *Right* in Christ and his Benefits. And *this Law* imposeth on us *Duty* to the *Lord-Redeemer*, and constituteth the *Conditions* on which we shall live by him, and so is of use for the Application of his Benefits; and according to this *New-Law* the *Redeemer* that hath bought us, doth *here govern us*; therefore according to *this Law* will *he judg* us. So that the Great Judgment at the Last Day, will be by *Christ as Redeemer*, (and God the Father in and by him) and so by the *Redeemer's Law*.

I will not dare to determine that there will then be no use of the Law of Works as a Rule of Judgment, (but none as the *Only Rule* to any); or that there will be no justifying Men from the Guilt of Death as due, according to the Sentence of that first Law.

But these things I may say, 1. That if there be any *Accusation* of Men *merely as sinners*, and as guilty of Death by the *first Law*, then must there be at Judgment a double *Justification* requisite against a *double Accusation*. One is against the *true Accusation*, that is, we *sinned* against the *Law of Works*, and thereby deserved the *Penalty*. Against this (confessing our sins) we plead, The *Blood of Christ procuring us pardon*, and that Pardon as *given* us *conditionally* in the *New-Covenant*. Then comes the *second Justification* to be necessary, in that here we are devolved over to the *New Covenant*, and to be tryed by the *Redeemer* and his *Law:* and

then the Queſtion is only, Whether we have performed the *Condition* of the *New-Covenant* or *not?* Againſt the *falſe Accuſations* [that we *have not*] we muſt be juſtified by our *Actual Performance*, as the *Matter* of our Righteouſneſs. This Juſtification is *ſubordinate* to the former; and by this the former is brought to perfection, and ſo we are *abſolutely juſtified.*

2. Note alſo; That the Scripture doth ſo much *ſuppoſe* our *Antecedent Conditional Juſtification* by *God-Creator* in the *Blood of Chriſt*, that it ſeemeth to deſcribe the *general Judgment*, as if that former were done already, and the latter only or mainly were apt to do, as the Work of that Day, as the means of making the firſt *abſolute.* For *Chriſt as Redeemer* ſhall be the *Judg*; and for *loving* or *not loving himſelf* in his *Members*, ſhall the *Sentence* paſs: not upon the mere terms of the Law of Works, but for improving or not-*improving* their Talents of Grace, I mean of Mercy received from the Redeemer. Here is therefore a *Particular Juſtification* from the *falſe Charge* of non-performance of the Goſpel-Conditions, neceſſary; and alſo a *General Juſtification* from the *guilt of all ſin* indeed committed, neceſſary, as the conjunct Grounds of the *total* and *final Univerſal Abſolution.* Which we may, according to the tenor of the Law, conceive of as in this order, (and ſo produceth alſo the Juſtification in our Conſciences, according to the Rule of the ſame Law).

Firſt, The great Queſtion is, *Whether the Sinner is to be ſent to Heaven or to Hell? Saved or Damned?* The Accuſer ſaith, *He is to be damned.* (Here's the Accuſation *de fine*).

His

His first Accusation, as the *Reason* is, [*Lord, he hath broke thy Law, which saith, The Soul that liveth shall die*]. The Justifier saith, [*I pardoned all Men for the sake of the Blood of the Redeemer, on Condition of Faith and Repentance*]. (This part of the Judgment, that in the Gospel-Description seemeth to suppose as done).

The next Charge or Accusation is, [*Lord, he did not truly believe and repent, and therefore hath no benefit by the Law of Grace:* (or else) *He added not sincere Obedience, or did not persevere, and therefore hath lost his Right to thy Pardon*]. Against this we are justified by pleading *Not-guilty*; that is, That we did *Believe*, *Repent*, *Obey sincerely*, and *Persevere*. Upon which our Judg will determine, That according to the *Law of Grace* we are *Not-Guilty* in the Point we are Accused, and consequently that *universally* we are not lyable to Condemnation.

By all this it appeareth that *Justification* being considered; 1. As opposite to *Accusation*; 2. As opposite to *Condemnation*; That there is a *Two-fold Accusation*, and consequently a *Two-fold Justification* oppositе thereto, and that there is a *Two-fold Condemnation* of the wicked *virtually* in Law: Also that there is one *final Peremptory Sentence* of Condemnation in Judgment, which shall pass upon them upon this double Ground. And there is one *final Sentence* of *Life* for the Justification of Believers in Judgment; which passeth also on the double ground of the foresaid double Justification, as opposite to Accusation: of which the first only is Justification *a Reatu*, the second, *Contra Reatum falsum impactum*; *vel quod rei non sumus*: These

are done in Law at our first Believing, from which time forward there is no Condemnation to them that are in Christ; but before they were in Christ by Faith, there was a Condemnation. Also that though there be *two Laws* that *Condemn*, yet there is but *one* that *Justifieth*; though that one hath a double justifying force, from the foresaid double Accusation; wherefore one is *à Condemnatione Legis veteris*; the other is *ne Condemnemur Lege novâ, vel in Judicio per Legem novam.* Which I make all plain thus.

1. The Law of *Works* condemneth Men as *sinners*, (still pardoned).

2. The Law of *Grace* condemneth them further as *such* and *such sinners in specie, viz.* as *final Rejecters of Christ.*

The first of these the Law of *Grace remitteth conditionally before Faith* (to all) *actually*, upon *Believing.* The last is *never remitted*, nor any justified from it.

I shewed before how there may be a double Accusation in Judgment: one true, that we were to be condemned as Sinners: the other false, That we were to be condemned as Unbelievers, Rebels against Christ, or Apostates. We are justified from one by pleading Remission, and from the other by pleading *Not-Guilty*; that is, our *personal Righteousness, in tantum*, so far as that Charge extendeth. This is Justification by *Plea* or *Apologie*, whether by others, or Christ as our Advocate: Upon which, as the Ground, or *Justitia Causæ*, follows the final absolute sentential Justification from the main charge (of being lyable to Damnation, and having no right to Salvation) by Christ as *Judg.*

Though

Though it may be said also, That he justifieth in the foresaid subordinate sense, from the particular Accusations, (of being condemnable as Sinners, and being Unbelievers, and being Condemnable as Unbelievers) as Judg, both as he concludeth of the distinct parts of the Sentence before the sum or whole, and as he concludeth those Parts and Premises in the whole: First, Judging, [*He is not condemnable for sin simply as against the Law of Works*]. Next, [*He is not guilty of final non-performance of the Conditions of the Law of Grace; therefore not condemnable for that, or by that Law*]: And then, [*Therefore he is not condemnable at all, but hath Right to Life*]. That I doubt not but God will make Man capable of a shorter dispatch at that final Judgment, than we use to have at Humane Barrs, and therefore our Pleadings will not be so particular and express. But yet as they will proceed on these Grounds, so this Order and these Reasons of the Sentence will be made manifest to the World, how short soever it be, and we shall be enabled to see the implyed Reason and Order, without particular dilatory Expressions.

By this it appeareth that it is impossible that a Creature can be under any Law, whose Office it is to be the *Rule of Actions* and *Judgment*; but he must be *judged*, and so either *Justified* or *Condemned* by that Law: which is expressed also in Scripture by our being *judged according to our Works*; that is, his performing or not-performing the Conditions of the premiant or penal Act of that Law. And to be *judged according to our Works*, is to be *justified or condemned according to our Works*: which *Works* must needs be *part* of the *Cause* to be then tryed;

tryed; and every *Cause* is *Just* or *Unjust*: and the justice of the *Cause*, is the justice of the *Person* as to that *Cause*: and a Man is therefore justified by the *Judg*, because he is *just*, his *Cause being just*. And so is it no hard matter for a willing unprejudiced Mind, to see how Works do or do not justifie, though perhaps they may differ about the fitness of each others Notions and Expressions hereabouts.

I confess I think that those plain vulgar Christians, that never troubled their heads with the Notions of Divines, about which are most of our Controversies, have as right, if not much righter apprehensions of the Substance of this Doctrine of Justification than most others. And that very Speech, which the *Marrow of Modern Divinity* so blameth, as joyning our *own Righteousness with Christ's*, to make up one entire Righteousness, is yet in it self no unfit Expression, but apt to set forth the very scope of the Gospel; and in the Mouth of a sound Christian it is sound Divinity: I mean these vulgar words, [*We must do our best, and God will help us by his Grace, and forgive us wherein we fail*]: or, [*Christ by his Spirit causeth all the Regenerate to Believe, Repent, and sincerely obey him to the death, and forgiveth all their sins*]. This is plain Doctrine, which any honest Country-man may understand, though never so illiterate; and which is not only enough for Salvation, as to this Point, if soundly believed, but for ought I know, may be more than most Disputers will suffer themselves and others to know quietly, without contradicting it again by their Novelties. And I doubt not, if the word *Justification* be not known, or ever heard,

(which

(which yet I am far from desiring) yet while the Doctrine of *Remission of Sin*, and Right to Life, is known and believed, then is the same thing known in other words. And it's not inobservable, that the Apostle's Creed rather useth the term [*Forgiveness of sin*], which poor People better understand, and not the term [*Justification*], about which the Learned have filled the World with needless Quarrels.

Forgiveness of Sin is not the *whole Righteousness*. God never forgiveth *his sin*, that hath *nothing but sin*: He never made a grant of the forgiveness of all sins, without Exceptions, but only of the forgiveness of all upon *condition* of our performing the *Gospel-Conditions*: And the *Condition* is a plain *Exception* of the *non-performance* of it self, out of the Matter of the Pardon. Inherent Personal Righteousness is confessed by all Protestants and Christians. A Righteousness which makes not Righteous, so far, is a palpable Contradiction. To make Righteous, is to justifie *Constitutivè*. So far as any Man is *Constituted Just*, God will, 1. *Esteem* him, and *Accept* him as Just; 2. *Sentence* him Just; 3. And *use* him as Just in Execution. And Christ the Advocate will *maintain* him Just, if there be need or cause.

When the word [*Justification*] is taken only for *Remission of Sin*, and Right to Life, (or *judging* us such as have this) then it is a needless question to ask, Whether it consist materially in any Works or Actions of our own: Faith and Repentance can be but preparatory Conditions of it, and none of the Matter, only Christ's Righteousness meriteth it. If *Justification* be taken for *Making*, *Esteeming*,

Esteeming, or *Sentencing* us Performers of the Gospel-Conditions, then the matter of it is only in our own Hearts and Lives. If *Justification* be taken universally, it comprehendeth both the former. If taken for the final Sentence pronouncing us *non damnandos sed glorificandos*, then it is grounded on the two former, (whereof one is subordinate to the other) as being *Causæ duplicis duplex Justitia.*

The Fifth Controversie between us, is; *Whether the New-Law or Covenant have any Penalty constituted by it self, or whether only the Law of Works do constitute penalty?*

To this I need to say no more than I have done already, because his Opinion is grounded on the former, That there is but one Law; which overthrown, this falls with it.

Mr. *C*'s Error lyeth in his confounding *Legem in genere*, *Cum hâc Lege Operum in specie*. A Law in general is a Determination or Constitution Authoritative *de jure*, and obligeth *ad Obedientiam aut ad Pœnam*. But Laws are several ways *specified*, as is afore declared, and I will not repeat.

The Penalty proper to the New-Law, consisteth in these Particulars following.

1. To have no *part in Christ*, to be no Member of him, not united or espoused to him, is one part of the Penalty, as it is *pœna damni*: Who will say that the Law of Works did threaten this? It would have been to *Adam* but a *Negation*, and no *Privation*, and so no Penalty.

2. The like may be said of the *missing of Justification and Pardon* of all sin; which is a part of the

the *pœna damni*, which the Law of Works knew not. Before the Law of Grace was enacted, and by Christ's Blood and the Promise, Remission was made possible; yea, conditionally given, it would have been no Penalty, though a misery, not to be forgiven.

3. The like may be said of the denyal of *Sanctifying Grace*, and the help of the Spirit to them that quench it.

4. And the hopelesness of their Condition that sin against the Holy Ghost.

5. And the non-liberation from eternal Torments.

6. But especially the *Peremptory Sentence* of Judgment, and Execution according. The Law of Works being violated, the Communication was dispensable on valuable Considerations, and the Obligation to Punishment dissolvable, and the Punishment it self removable: But the New-Law hath affixed a prediction to the Commination, making the said Commination indispensable, the Obligation undissolvable, and the Punishment certainly everlasting and remediless; not only (as the *first Law*) *providing no Remedy*, but decreeing that *none shall be provided* at all.

But I have mentioned these before, about the diversification of God's Laws, and there also mentioned a real difference in the *Pain* of *Sense*, between that which is threatned in the Law of Works, and of Grace. But if Mr. *C.* be resolved to confound these Sinners, and say God hath but *one Law*, looking only at the general nature of a Law, when he should look at the distinct *species*, then there's no Remedy.

6. Our

6. Our Sixth Controverſie is; *Whether the ſame thing which is the Condition of our Salvation* (as Mr. *C.* confeſſeth Obedience is) *be not alſo a Condition of our final ſentential Juſtification, and of our Right to Salvation* (though not of our *firſt Right*)? I affirm and he denies.

Our firſt Right to Salvation is given with our Juſtification or Pardon, upon our firſt believing: but our Obedience upon Opportunity is a Condition *non-amittendi*, or without which it ſhall not *continue*, nor ſhall we have ever *Jus in re*. This I proved I think ſufficiently in the Poſtſcript of my Papers to Mr. *C.* but he eaſily put by all, with the diſtinction of [*Right to Salvation*] and [*Salvation it ſelf*].

Before I conſider his *Exceptions*, I will add this Anſwer to his Diſtinction. 1. He yeeldeth the whole Cauſe in acknowledging, 1. That *Juſtification* and Right to Salvation have the ſame Conditions, (which he could not deny). 2. That Obedience is a Condition of Salvation. 3. For his Diſtinction is *ſine differentiâ*; there is no ſuch thing in the World, no nor poſſible, as a proper *Condition of Salvation*, diſtinct from a *Condition of Right to it*. Firſt, I hope, with any fair Dealer, I may take it for granted that he doth not equivocate in the word *Condition*, taking it for a mere *Phyſical Qualification*, called a *Condition* or *Preparation*, in another ſenſe than ours; but that we are ſtill ſpeaking of a *Condition in ſenſu Civili, Legali, vel Morali*: Not as the Dryneſs of the Wood, or the Application of it to the Fire, is called a Condition of its Burning; nor as the valiant Mind of Souldiers

is

is a Condition of their valiant Fighting and Conquering, not imposed by the General, but naturally necessary by way of Qualification or Enablement: but it is a Condition constituted by a Promise, Law, Covenant, or Testament that we are speaking of. 1. I so explained my Mind fully. 2. The subject-Matter of our Dispute will be on no other sensed Condition; so that I may well take it for granted, that we are agreed in this, and that Mr. *C.* will not seek any Evasion by an Equivocation in this word.

And then the Case is past question; for every Condition is a *Condition of Right*, which I prove thus.

It is a Condition of that which the Promise giveth: But it is Right (to Salvation) which the Promise giveth; Therefore it is a Condition of Right (to Salvation). The Major is past dispute; it being the Condition of a Promise, and a part of that Promise, and its Office, to suspend the efficacy of the Promise or Donative Act. The Minor is as far past dispute with all that know, that the proper product of Laws, Covenants, Promises, *&c.* is Right or Dueness. The Promise gives nothing else immediately and naturally but Right. As Sanctification, Glorification, Health, Riches, or any benefit not relative; the Promise gives but Right to them, (though it be called a giving the thing it self morally, because God doth infallibly fulfil his Promise): But it is by actual natural Causation that the thing it self must be after given or conveyed. Therefore seeing we speak not of a Condition in a Physical sense, (as Eating is a Condition of Living) but in a moral, or civil, or judiciary

ciary sense; it is past doubt that it's essential to a *Condition* to have a respect to *Right*, and to be *Conditio juris, vel obtinendi, vel retinendi.*

And if the Assertors of the contrary be called to prove their distinction from the Scripture, you should see on what arbitrary Affirmations and Inventions of their own, such Doctrines are built. For instance, when it is promised, *Mark* 16. 16. That, *He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved*]. And *Rom.* 10. *Whosoever shall call on the Name of the Lord shall be saved*]. And *Heb.* 5. 9. *He became the Author of Eternal Salvation to all them that obey him*]. Prove now by such evidence as should move an impartial Man, that *Believing* only in the first Promise, and such other is *Conditio juris*; and that, [*Calling on the Name of the Lord, and obeying*] are not *Conditiones juris, vel obtinendi, vel retinendi*: That *Faith* only is a Condition in a judiciary sense, and Repentance, Love to God and Obedience are only Physically Conditions, or are Conditions of *Salvation*, but not of *Right* to Salvation: Prove that in the same Text, *Joh.* 16. 27. Faith is made a Condition of Right to God's Love, and Love to Christ is made a Condition of his Love, but not of Right to it; [*For the Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and have believed that I came out from God*]. Is here either reason or room for your distinction? [*Because*] is equally added to both, what-ever kind of Condition they are. The Text saith expresly, [*Blessed are they that do his Commandments, that they may have Right to the Tree of Life, and may enter in through the Gates into the City*]. And can you prove that by *Right* here is not meant *Right?*

And

And again obſerve that *Right* to Salvation, and Right to Juſtification at Judgment, are not, yea, cannot be denyed to have the ſame Conditions: For that which juſtifieth our *Cauſe*, will juſtifie us: But that which proveth our Right to Salvation, juſtifieth our Cauſe: For our Right to Salvation, *is* our Cauſe it ſelf to be then judged.

The Seventh Controverſie is, *Whether the words of the Goſpel-Promiſe or Grant, forgiving ſin, be properly a Sentence of Abſolution by God as Judg? Or rather an Act of Oblivion or Donation of Pardon and Life by God, partly as Benefactor, and partly as Rector, by Law and Guilt? Whether it be a Judicial Sentence only Virtually or Actually?* Mr. *C.* holdeth, that the words of the Goſpel, [He that believeth ſhall be juſtified and ſaved]; are *an actual ſentence of God as Judg:* I hold that it is but *an Act of Oblivion or Condonation*, and *a Gift of Life by God as Legiſlator* and *Benefactor*, and ſo but a *Virtual Sentence.*

But firſt let it be noted, That all this is but a Controverſie *de nomine*, and not *de re.* As long as we are agreed what this Act of Oblivion is, and what it doth, I take it to be a matter of no great moment, whether it be *de nomine*, to be called a *Sentence of Judgment*, properly or improperly. But my Reaſons are theſe.

1. This Goſpel-Act is called by the name of a Law, both in Propheſies, and in the words of the Goſpel it ſelf, *Iſa.* 2. 3. and 8. 16, 20. & 42. 4. & 51. 4. *Mich.* 4. 2. *Rom.* 3. 27. *Gal.* 6. 2. *Heb.* 7. 12. *Jam.* 11. 25. & 2. 8, 12. 1 *John* 3. 4. *Heb.* 8. 10, 16.

2. It is *Norma actionum moralium & norma judicis: Ergo*, it is a Law, 1 *John* 2. 5. *Heb.* 4. 2, 3. *Jam.* 1. 22. *John* 12. 47, 48. & 14. 23. & 15. 7. *John* 5. 22, 23. *Jam.* 2. 12. *Rev.* 20. 12, 13. *Matth.* 25. *Joh.* 3. 16, 18, 19.

3. A Day of Judgment is foretold and described in the Gospel, in which a final Sentence will pass on Men according to this Law. *Ergo*, &c. The Law and Sentence are not to be confounded: For they are not all one: The *Norma judicis*, according to which Men must be judged, is not the Judgment it self.

4. A Law is an universal Rule, and the sanction Conditional, and it neither justifieth nor condemneth any antecedently, but only after they have kept or broken it; And then it doth it *ut Lex*, and not *ut sententia judicis*: But a *judicial Sentence* is about particular or individual Persons and Cases; and supposeth a Law kept or broken, and supposeth Accusation, (virtual or actual): and also the particular Cause to be judicially decided, is, Whether the Law condemn or absolve the Person (virtually): Therefore the Law and Sentence are no more to be confounded, than a Lawgiver and a Judg.

5. If it be a Sentence of Judgment, it is a Sentence *secundum normam alicujus Legis*; some Law is the Rule of it: But no Law is the Rule of it; *Ergo*, it is no Sentence of Judgment, properly so called. If any Law be the Rule of it, it is either *an Universal Law made to Mankind*, or a particular Law (as that made to *Noah*, to *Abraham*, to the Jews by *Moses*, &c.) Not the latter: If the former, it must be that called the Law of Nature, and Covenant of Works made to *Adam*, or the Law

Law or Covenant of Grace made in Christ: Not the first: For to say, [He that believeth shall be saved], is not to Sentence as Judg according to the Law, [In the day that thou sinnest thou shalt die]. Not the latter; for then the Law and the Judgment were all one; and to say, [He that believeth shall be saved], would be all one as to say, [*John* or *Peter* hath right to Salvation according to the Promise, because they are true Believers]. He that is not satisfied with thus much, let him think as he list, for I shall trouble the Reader with no more.

The Eighth Controversie is, *Whether the judgment of Christ upon Believers after this Life, be not properly a justifying Sentence?* I affirm it, and Mr. *G.* denyeth it, and taketh it to be only a *Declaration of our Justification which we had in this Life.*

Every *judicial Sentence*, is a *Declaration*; but every *Declaration* is not a *judicial Sentence*. This Question therefore is not, Whether it be a *Declaration*, but whether it be not such a Declaration as is a *Sentence of the Judg* in Judgment? And if so, Whether it be not a *proper Justification*, (though here also I know, according to his meaning, the Question is but *de nomine*).

1. That is a proper Sentence of Judgment, which is the publick Declaration and Decision of the *Judg*, to put our Right to Salvation out of Controversie, against all Accusers, and to give us our *Jus Judicatum*, by determining of our *Jus Constitutum*; and this as an orderly means to our full possession. But such will be *Christ's Sentence* at

the Last Judgment; *Ergo*, it will be properly a Judicial Sentence.

2. The Scripture doth most exactly describe it as a *proper Judgment*; It calleth it the Act of Christ as Judg; It calleth it a Judgment: It describeth the Cause, the Persons, the Plea, the Evidence, and the Sentence; 1 *Pet.* 4. 5. 2 *Tim.* 4. 1. *Acts* 17. 31. *John* 5. 22, 24, 26, 27. *Rev.* 20. 12, 13. 1 *Cor.* 4. 4. 1 *Pet.* 1. 17. *Luk.* 10. 14. *Heb.* 6. 2. & 9. 27. *Eccles.* 12. 14. & 11. 9. *Rom.* 14. 10. 2 *Cor.* 5. 10. *Matth.* 25. throughout.

2. It is an Article of our Creed, That Christ shall come again to judg the quick and the dead; and among Christians past dispute. And if he *judg*, he *sentenceth* as Judg. And if he sentence as Judg, it is either a *Sentence* of *Justification*, or of *Condemnation*: All Judgment which is the *genus*, is found in one of these *special Acts*; There is no middle. It is a Judgment of *Condemnation* or of *Justification*. If the *Name* be questioned, I appeal to all Lawyers, all Men that live in Civil Societies, and all Divines; especially Protestants, who maintain against the Papists, that the word *Justifie* is most commonly taken in the New Testament in a *judiciary Sense*, for either the *Sentence* of a *Judg*, or the Plea of an Advocate at Judgment. I think this Controversie needeth no more words. And if I should here cite an hundred Divines that call this Last Judgment by the name of a *Sentence* of *Justification* or *Condemnation*, I should merit nothing of the Reader, but rebuke for troubling him with unnecessary words.

And

And now having reviewed all that I find remaining Controverted, between this Learned, Reverend and Pious Brother and my self, about the Matter which he thought meet to Animadvert on, (or at least all that is worth the Reader's notice). I am glad that our Differences are brought into so narrow a room; and that it is very doubtful whether every one of them be not only *de nomine*: And I think it but a needless trouble to the Reader, to answer all his numerous Citations out of *Amesius*, *Piscator*, *Paræus*, *Zanchy*, *Calvin*, *Davenant*, &c. and such late Divines, which make up the main Body of his Reply; Nor to make so tedious an enquiry, Whether he or I do best understand those Writers Sense: The Controversies themselves being cleared, I have done. And my design is but this;

1. To perswade Divines not to make God's Servants believe that they differ in great and weighty Matters, and so to render them unfit for each others Love and Communion, when they differ but in *Words* and *Logical Notions*.

2. To perswade Men to suffer their Brethren peaceably to rest in *that Truth*, and those *Expressions* of it, which are found in *Scripture*, and the *Church Universal* for above a *thousand years rested in*, and not make *Humane Notions* seem necessary to our Salvation and Church-Communion: Nor in a siding Humour to set the Phrases of some late honoured Divines, against Scripture and the Universal Church, and then to make them Engines of destruction, by making them seem needful Truths, which are but new incongruous Notions, which must at last be attacqued, to force them to confess that their meaning is the same with that which others long have taught.

Pos-

POSTSCRIPT.

I Must intreat the Reader, when he judgeth of the Second Case, (about the Interest of *Works* with Faith, in our Title to Life) to remember, That the Question is not;

1. About Works of Innocency.

2. Nor Works of the Mosaical Law.

3. Nor Works meriting of God by their worth, in point of Commutative Justice, (or the foresaid governing Legal Justice.)

4. Nor of any Acts of Obedience to Christ as Christ as antecedent to Faith and Justification.

5. Nor of External good Works of Charity, as antecedent to Faith, or to our first Justification.

6. Nor any Works, to which is given the least part of that which is proper to God, to Christ, to the Spirit, to the Promise.

But I must intreat him to see the Case stated in the Preface to my Disputations of Justification, and to remember that those that I oppose do hold;

1. That Faith it self, as an Act of ours, is part of the Works to be denied as a Means or Condition of our Justification, and so a part of that Subordinate Righteousness, and that we are justified by it only as an Instrument.

2. They say, That he seeks the prohibited Justification by Works, who looketh to be justified by be-

believing in Christ as Teacher, King, or any Act of Faith besides the receiving his Righteousness.

3. Much more he that thinketh Repentance, Love to Christ, Desire of him, Prayer for Pardon, *&c.* or any other Act of Man, is a Means or Condition of our Justification or Pardon: To be justified by any such Act but as part of the Condition, is to be justified by Works.

4. Much more to make sincere Obedience the Condition of Continued or Final Justification in Judgment. See the rest of the Controversies in the aforecited Preface and Books. And also in my *Pacification* or *Catholick Theology*, where this Cause is handled positively and defensively: And he that blameth me for writing so many Books of the same thing, should be one that first considereth how many Books and daily Invectives and Censures of Men that never understood the Cause, have called me to it, and made it necessary. Four or five Divines rose in *Holland*, especially at *Frankera*, (notwithstanding the excellent *Amesius* his better endeavours) who have owned ill Definitions of God's Covenants, and laid the Foundations of Antinomian Libertinism, (especially *Maccovius*, and *Cluto*, and *Cocceius*, and *Cloppenburgius* too much consented) making the Covenant in Constitution to be nothing but Election by Eternal Decree, and the Covenant in Execution, to be the fulfilling or execution of that Decree of Election in all our Mercies; and Justification to be but God's eternal Decree, and Man's Justification in *Conscience*, and before Men, with other such confounding Notions; when verily the better Description of God's King-

Kingdom, Laws, and Covenants should be in our Childrens Catechism; and should not be unknown to Learned Men; nor should they thus learnedly possess many honest godly (but not long and througly studying) Ministers, with such Notions which corrupt their *Conceptions*, their Charity, their Sermons, and their Converse as hinderances of Truth, Piety, Love, and Peace.

FINIS.

A POSTSCRIPT ABOUT Mr. *DANVERS*'s Last BOOK.

WHen this Book was coming out of the Press, I received another Book of Mr. *Danvers* against Infants Baptism, in which he mentioneth Dr. *Tullies proving* what a *Papist* I am, in his *Justif. Paul.* (with Dr. *Pierces* former Charges) and lamenting that no more yet but *one Dr. Tully* hath *come forth to Encounter me*, Epist. and Pag. 224. The perusal of that Book (with Mr. *Tombs short Reflections*) directeth me to say but this instead of any further Confutation.

That it is (as the former) so full of false Allegations set off with the greatest Audacity (even a few Lines of my own about our meeting at Saint *James*'s left with the Clerk, grosly falsified) and former falsifications partly justified, and partly past over, and his most passionate Charges ground-

ed upon Mistakes, and managed by Misreports, sometime of *Words*, sometime of the *Sense*, and sometime of *Matters* of *Fact*; in short, it is such a bundle of *Mistake*, *Fierceness* and *Confidence*, that I take it for too *useless* and *unpleasant* a Work to give the World a particular Detection of these Evils. If I had so little to do with my Time as to write it, I suppose that few would find leisure to read it: And I desire no more of the willing Reader, then seriously to peruse my Book (*More Reasons for Infants Church-membership*) with his, and to examine the Authors about whose Words or Sense we differ. Or if any would be Informed at a cheaper rate, he may read Mr. *Barrets* Fifty *Queries* in two sheets. And if Mr. *Tombes* revile me, for not transcribing or answering more of his *Great Book*, when I tell the Reader that I *suppose him to have the Book before him*, and am not bound to transcribe such a Volume already in Print, and that I answer as much as I think needs an Answer, leaving the rest as I found it to the Judgment of each Reader, he may himself take this for a *Reply*; but I must judg of it as it is. ¶

I find but one thing in the Book that needeth any other Answer, than to peruse what is already Written: And that is about Baptizing Naked: My Book was written 1649. A *little before*, *common uncontrolled Fame was*, that not *far from us* in *one place many of them* were *Baptized naked*, reproving the Cloathing way as Antiscriptural: I never heard Man deny this Report: I conversed with divers of Mr. *Tombes*'s Church, who denied it not; As never any denied it *to me*, so I never *read* one that did deny it to my knowledg: He now tells me Mr. *Fisher*,

Fisher, Mr. *Haggar*, and Mr. *Tombes* did: Let any Man read Mr. *Tombes* Answer to me, yea and that Passage by him now cited, and see whether there be a word of denial: Mr. *Fisher* or *Haggar* I never saw: Their Books I had seen, but never read two Leaves to my remembrance of Mr. *Fishers*, though I numbered it with those that were written on that Subject, as well I might: I knew his Education and his Friends, and I saw the Great Volume before he turned *Quaker*, but I thought it enough to read Mr. *Tombes* and others that wrote before him, but I read not him, nor all Mr. *Haggars*: If I had, I had not taken them for competent Judges of a fact *far from them*, and that *three years* after: Could they say, that *no one ever did so?* The truth is that three years after, mistaking my words, as if I had affirmed it to be *their ordinary practice* (as you may read in them) which I never did, nor thought, they vehemently deny this: (And such *heedless reading* occasioneth many of Mr. *Danvers* Accusations). I never said that *no Man ever denied it*, for I have not read *all that ever was written*, nor spoken with all the World: But *no Man ever denied it to me*, nor did I *ever read any that denied it*. And in a matter of Fact, if that Fame be not credible, which is of things *Late* and *Near*, and not *Contradicted* by *any one* of the *most interessed Persons themselves*, no not by Mr. *Tombes* himself, we must surcease humane Converse: Yet do I not thence undertake that the same was true, either of *those Persons*, or such as other Writers beyond Sea have said it off. I *saw not* any one Baptized by Mr. *Tombes* or any other in *River* or elsewhere by *Dipping at Age*: If you *do no such thing*,

I am sorry that I believed it, and will recant it. Had *I not seen* a *Quaker* go naked through *Worcester* at the Assizes, and read the *Ranters* Letters full of Oathes, I could have proved neither of them. And yet I know not where so long after to find my Witnesses: I abhor Slanders, and receiving ill Reports unwarrantably: I well know that this is not their ordinary Practice: The *Quakers* do not those things now, which many did at the rising of the Sect; and if I could, I would believe they never did them.

2. This Book of Mr. *Danvers*, with the rest of the same kind, increase my hatred of the *Disputing Contentious* way of writing, and my trouble that the Cause of the *Church* and *Truth* hath so oft put on me a necessity to write in a Disputing way, against the Writings of so many Assailants.

3. It increaseth my Grief for the Case of Mankind, yea of well-meaning godly Christians, who are unable to judg of many Controversies agitated, otherwise than by some Glimpses of poor Probability, and the esteem which they have of the Persons which do manage them, and indeed take their Opinions upon trust from those whom they most reverence and value; and yet can so hardly know whom to follow, whilst the grossest Mistakes are set off with as great confidence and holy pretence, as the greatest Truths. O how much should Christians be pitied, that must go through so great Temptations!

4. It increaseth my Resolution, had I longer to live, to converse with Men that I would *profit*, or *profit* by, either as a *Learner* hearing what they *have* to say, without importunate Contradiction, or as a *Teacher* if they desire to Learn of me: A *School* way

way may do something to increase Knowledg; but *drenching Men*, and *striving* with them, doth but set them on a fiercer striving against the Truth: And when they that have need of seven and seven years Schooling more, under some clear well studied Teacher, are made Teachers themselves, and then turned loose into the World (as *Sampsons* Foxes) to militate *for* and *with* their *Ignorance*, what must the Church suffer by such Contenders?

5. It increaseth my dislike of that Sectarian dividing hurtful Zeal, which is described *James* 3. and abateth *my* wonder at the rage of Persecutors: For I see that the same Spirit maketh the same kind of Men, even when they most cry out against Persecutors, and separate furthest from them.

6. It resolveth me more to enquire less after the Answers to Mens *Books* than I have done: And I shall hereafter think never the worse of a Mans writings, for hearing that they are answered: For I see it is not only easie for a *Talking Man* to *talk on*, and to *say something for* or *against anything*, but it is *hard* for them to *do otherwise*, even to hold their *Tongues*, or *Pens*, or *Peace*: And when I change this Mind, I must give the greatest *belief* to *Women* that will talk most, or to them that *live longest*, and so are like to have the last word, or to them that can train up militant Heirs and Successors to defend them when they are dead, and so propagate the Contention. If a sober Consideration of the first and second writing (yea of *positive Principles*) will not inform me, I shall have little hope to be much the wiser for all the rest.

7. I am fully satisfied that even good Men are here so far from Perfection, that they must bear with

with odious faults and injuries in one another, and be habituated to a ready and easie forbearing and forgiving one another. I will not so much as describe or denominate Mr. *Danvers* Citations of Dr. *Pierce*, to prove my Popery and Crimes, nor his passages about the Wars, and about my Changes, Self-contradictions, and Repentances, lest I do that which savoureth not of Forgiveness: O what need have we all of Divine Forgiveness!

8. I shall yet less believe what any Mans *Opinion* (yea or Practice) is by his *Adversaries Sayings, Collections, Citations*, or most vehement Asseverations, than ever I have done, though the Reporters pretend to never so much Truth, and pious Zeal.

9. I shall less trust a *confounding ignorant* Reader or Writer, that hath not an accurate *defining* and *distinguishing* Understanding, and hath not a *mature, exercised, discerning* Knowledg than ever I have done; and especially if he be engaged in a *Sect* (which alas, how few parts of the Christian World escape!) For I here (and in many others) see, that you have no way to seem Orthodox with such, but to run quite into the contrary Extream: And if I write against both Extreams, I am taken by such Men as this, but to be *for both and against both*, and to *contradict my self*. When I write against the Persecutors, I am one of the Sectaries, and when I write against the Sectaries, I am of the Persecutors side: If I belie not the Prelatists, I am a Conformist: If I belie not the *Anabaptists, Independents*, &c. I am one of them: If I belie not the Papists, I am a Papist; if I belie not the *Arminians*, I am an *Arminian*; if I belie not the *Calvinists*

vinists, I am with *Pseudo-Tilenus* and his Brother, *purus putus Puritanus*, and one *Qui totum Puritanismum totus spirat* (which *Joseph Allen* too kindly interpreteth): If *I* be for *lawful Episcopacy*, and *lawful Liturgies* and *Circumstances* of *Worship*, I am a *temporizing Conformist*: If *I* be for *no more*, *I* am an intollerable Non-Conformist (at this time forced to part with House, and Goods, and Library, and all save my Clothes, and to possess nothing, and yet my Death (by six months Imprisonment in the Common Goal) is sought after and continually expected. If *I* be as very *a Fool*, and as *little understand my self*, and as much *contradict my self*, as all these Confounders and Men of Violence would have the World believe, it is much to *my cost*, being hated by them all while I seek but for the common peace.

10. But I have also further learned hence to *take up my content in Gods Approbation*, and (having done my duty, and pitying their own and the Peoples snares) to make but small account of all the Reproaches of all sorts of Sectaries; what they will say against me living or dead, I leave to themselves and God, and shall not to please a Censorious Sect, or any Men whatever, be false to my Conscience and the Truth: If the Cause I defend be not of God, I desire it may fall: If it be, I leave it to God how far He will prosper it, and what Men shall think or say of me: And I will pray for Peace to him that will not hate and revile me for so doing. Farewell.

Septemb. 4. 1675.

FINIS.